THE

BUDGET,

A

COLLECTION of LETTERS,

IN FAVOUR OF

PUBLIC LIBERTY.

Publiſhed in the Interval of 1764 to 1770.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. III.

LONDON:

Printed for J. WALKER, Paternoſter-Row.

M.DCC.LXXXIX.

BODLEIAN
11 APR 1946
LIBRARY

PREFACE.

THE far greater part of the following Eſſays, owe their exiſtence to the accidental meeting of a few Gentlemen at a place of public reſort, in the ſummer of the year 1764; who though unknown to each other before that time, were not long in mutually diſcloſing their common attachment to the principles of PUBLIC LIBERTY.

About that time, the clerical hand was obſerved to appear frequently in the public prints, in aid of the ſyſtem of politics then in faſhion, which ſeemed to aim at the deſtruction of *that* which had been adopted and ſettled ſomething more than ſeventy years before.

The Favourite, whoſe principles were no ſecret to the public, though no longer viſible at the ſteerage, had put a ſort of men into a capacity of executing his purpoſes, who by their company and connections were known to have no predilection for the events in 1688 and 1714.

The Duke of *Newcaſtle*, the old and faithful friend of the Hanover line, was

honoured with a diſmiſſion from public buſineſs. He had furniſhed almoſt the whole eccleſiaſtical department with Chriſtian Paſtors, the beſt, as he once had occaſion to obſerve, that could be ſelected from the voluminous roll of Aſpirants.* Numbers of them were then eating the Veniſon and drinking the claret his patronage had procured for them. But the Scotch Millennium had commenced, and the ſolitary Duke was left to ſay his own grace over his own mutton and pudding.

Clerks

* The anecdote is worth preſerving. Biſhop M—dd—x wanted ſomething of the Miniſtry for a near relation. He applied. It was not convenient to oblige him. Biſhop M—dd—x became a minority-man, and ſpoke (for he was one of the few benchers who could ſpeak) againſt the Miniſters, with vehemence, and occaſionally dwelt upon their blunders and want of political ſagacity. On one of theſe occaſions he was anſwered by the Duke of *Newcaſtle*, to the following effect. "It becomes his Majeſty's ſervants, my Lords, to be "deeply humbled under the charitable rebukes of "a venerable chriſtian prelate. Primitive Anti-"quity affords examples of great Princes, who "have chearfully and ſubmiſſively expiated their "miſdemeanors by a courſe of Church-diſcipline. "And what are *we*, that we ſhould refuſe to un-"dergo the penance preſcribed for our miſdeeds!

"We

Clerks as well as laymen, being inliſted, muſt do the allotted duty. The latter were to write up the Crown-prerogative to the higheſt pitch; and the *Alliance* requiring that the prerogative of the church ſhould riſe in proportion, the ſcribes of the ſacred order had it in their inſtructions, to magnify their office, to exalt the church above the Goſpel, and to repreſent the apprehenſions of danger to the proteſtant religion from the increaſe of Popery, to be groundleſs and ridiculous.

With theſe topics the News-papers abounded, to the great indignation of all who had lived in the auſpicious days of

" We acknowledge our frailty, my Lords, with " all humility, and have no amends to make to " the public, but repentance, and promiſes of fu- " ture amendment. But, my Lords, we are but " men, and it is impoſſible but we muſt be ſome- " times miſtaken, with the beſt intentions in the " world. For example, my Lords, we uſe all " poſſible care and caution to have that venerable " bench" *(nodding towards the biſhops)* " ſupplied " with men of good ſenſe, ſerious piety, and diſ- " intereſted probity. But in ſpite of all our cir- " cumſpection, an odd wrong-headed man will " ſometimes get ſeated there, and will be ever, now " and then, reminding us of our Fallibility."

George II. and among others of more conſequence, of theſe few friends to Liberty civil and eccleſiaſtical, who immediately agreed to meet theſe Champions of Deſpotiſm and Superſtition, on their own ground, as they occaſionally appeared in the papers of the day or the week; and to have their eye more particularly on the operations of the Church militant.

When a few months after, this little BAND arrived at their winter quarters reſpectively, their agreement was communicated to one or two of their confidential friends, who chearfully entered into the party; but as far as the collector and editor of theſe occaſional pieces is informed, the whole number of thoſe who were conſcious to and acceſſaries in this laudable combination, were not more than *ſix*, all of them men of letters, and (what it may be proper to mention) all of them ſerious chriſtians, and zealous proteſtants.

It happened, luckily enough for the cauſe, that ſome of them were in ſituations which enabled them to procure pretty good intelligence; and it was ſoon diſcovered, that the late Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* was the profeſſed patron of, and

and an occaſional performer in this eccleſiaſtical *Drama*. Several papers ſigned, *Sacerdos Ruſticus*, *A Proteſtant*, *Moderato*, *Miſopſeudes*, *Candidus*. *A. B.* The *capital C*, and ſeveral others, were conjectured, from certain circumſtances, to be his manufacture; and the diligence of his Grace's *Runners* to find out the Anſwerers, took away all doubt of the fact.

But beſides the few above-mentioned, who were conſcious to each other's performances, there were others whoſe valuable pieces are taken into this collection that were not in any confidential connection with the original BAND. Theſe additional eſſays will be found here and there chiefly in the *ſecond* and *third* of theſe volumes. Of theſe writers the Editor confeſſes, (one excepted) he had no perſonal knowledge. Some of them he believes might be Diſſenters. But he chuſes not to employ conjectures, where what he knows with more certainty, may be ſufficient to gratify the curioſity of thoſe, who are inclined to be ſatisfied with a general information, where the nature of the inquiry makes it unreaſonable to expect a minute detail, that might be prejudicial to ſome very worthy individuals.

It will preſently occur to the reader of theſe papers, that no regular plan of operations could be ſettled among the members of an aſſociation, whoſe buſineſs aroſe, not from any previous knowledge of what would be demanded of them within a ſtated time, but from incidents which it was not in their power to foreſee, and for which they could make no preparation, but from day to day.

News-papers deal in politics, in religion, in matters of law, in parliamentary diſcuſſions, in the proceedings of different bodies of men, and in obſervations upon the principles and conduct of particular perſons in every ſtation of life.

All that could be done therefore in the caſe under conſideration, was to aſſign to each member of the BAND, that particular province which was moſt ſuitable to his particular profeſſion, or which fell in with his frequent opportunities of having the beſt information, where facts were to be the ſubject of examination. But this partition of duty could not always be obſerved; the hand for which there was a preſent call, was not always in the way, and his part on ſuch occaſions, was then to

to be performed by ſome other of the brotherhood.

There was indeed one Gentleman in the fraternity, whoſe attention and diligence ſupplied a number of deficiencies of this kind. Of *his* vigilance and activity whenever the enemy appeared, the reader, perhaps, may form ſome idea by peruſing the paper on *Imbutation*, thoſe ſigned, *Phlebotomus*, *Saxifragus*, *Lothario*, *Apicius Eccleſiaſticus*, *Camillus*,* *Inceptor*,† the *Anſwer* of the Archbiſhop of *Paris*, to the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, the letter to the Biſhop of *Albany* elect, and not leſs than twice as many more.

By the ſame hand was manufactured, *the caſtrated chapter of Triſtram Shandy*, concerning which, as it may ſeem to be a little foreign to the general deſign of this collection, it will be neceſſary to add a piece of ſecret hiſtory.

The Reſtorer of this *Caſtration*, had formerly been in very friendly connections with the Author of *Triſtram Shandy*, which

* The author of this paper was much inquired after, and not without tokens of anxiety, which ſuch a *jeu d'eſprit* could hardly be ſuppoſed to occaſion in an unconſcious heart.

† See the note, Vol. III. p. 171.

he

he inſtantly and totally relinquiſhed, upon finding that the ſaid author varied in the common courſe of his practice, not only from his original political creed, but, in ſome notorious inſtances, from thoſe laudable maxims of morality, and even of common humanity, which his book was underſtood to inculcate.

The firſt project of this book is ſaid to have been ſuggeſted to *Sterne* by the characters and writings of two remarkable authors, diſtinguiſhed in the *caſtrated chapter*, by the names of *Random* and *Paradox*. By what motives *Sterne* was induced to drop the former in the courſe of his ſtory, is not known. It ſhould ſeem however, that he afterwards repented of his lenity, perhaps upon ſome perſonal offence taken, when they met in *France* or *Italy*. Be that as it may, *Sterne* took his ſatisfaction of him in a later work, where he exhibited him in the character of *Smellfungus*.

The other had afforded ſo ample a range for *Sterne*'s ſort of humour, that it was with the utmoſt difficulty the temptation to inrich his book with the noſtrums and viſions of ſo capital a *Réveur*, could be over-ruled by the interpoſition of a perſon, whoſe friendſhip was of no little conſequence

quence to them both. At length the bargain was ſtruck, and the Satyriſt was bought off, as *Sterne* himſelf reported to his friends, with a *Princely Sum.*

Whether *Sterne* ever ſaw the *caſtrated chapter*, is not known. It was handed about in Manuſcript long before it went to the preſs. The author was diligently ſought for by one who had ſeen the writing, and ſeemed to have a commiſſion to talk with the ſaid author. But he was then at a diſtance in the Country, and before he returned to town, the *St James's Chronicle* had got hold of it. He is now gone *ad pauciores. Peace to his Manes!*

The occaſion and tendency of moſt of the following Eſſays, will be eaſily underſtood from the contents. A few explanatory notes are added, where it was thought neceſſary. A profuſion of Commentary, where the text is ſufficiently intelligible without it, is an inſult upon the common ſenſe of the readers. In ſome very few inſtances indeed, and where the matter in diſpute could not otherwiſe be clearly ſtated, the whole controverſy is inſerted, as in the debate between the *two Students*, between *Tyro Phileleutherus* and his reſpondents, &c. The

The general ſcope of this collection, and a retroſpective view of the men and times to which the Letters relate, will ſerve to convince ſome of the readers of them, that the writers were not miſled by precarious evidence, to give theſe warnings to their countrymen, of what they apprehended was faſt approaching. The formidable Figure has now, by no imperceptible progreſs, drawn near enough to catch the eye of the moſt indolent and inattentive of thoſe, who are likely to be ſufferers by the cataſtrophe. It is true, the overgrown power, and the manifold corruptions of the Church, are principal objects in the following collection: But as the *Drum eccleſiaſtic*, has, in all ages, been the call for volunteers to inliſt under the banner of political Deſpotiſm, the chief care of Patriotiſm upon Britiſh ground, ſhould be, to ſilence *that* in the firſt place: It would be found afterwards, much eaſier to deal with the Church's cooperator in iniquity.

It is proper (however theſe Eſſayiſts may have loſt their labour) that they who will condeſcend to read what they have written, ſhould know, that theſe faithful monitors were not idle whenever they thought their

their talents, though ever ſo inconſiderable, might be of uſe to their Fellow-ſubjects. Such of them as are ſtill living, deſire to have their labours judged of, not by the ſucceſs of them among thoſe who ſhould have taken the warning, but by the *preſent* ſtate of things, that is to ſay, by the effects of the grand Alliance, the combined power of Church and State at the end of the year MDCCLXXIII.

The connivance and indulgence of Popery, is one indiſpenſible ingredient in this *compounded* Policy. Perhaps it may be otherwiſe imagined by thoſe, who ſee not how neceſſary the *Spirit* of it is to ſupport our preſent eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment. The late controverſies concerning Subſcription to human forms, have, however, convinced conſiderable numbers, that the Church, in her preſent circumſtances, can no longer ſtand upon a *Proteſtant* bottom. Papiſtical *impoſition*, and papiſtical *power* to inforce it, are neceſſary now for her very exiſtence in her preſent unreformed ſtate; and while ſhe continues in *that* ſtate, to expoſe the errors and impoſitions of Popery, is of diſſervice to her; and the parties of whom ſhe borrows the

power,

power, if ſhe is diſpoſed to avail herſelf of it effectually, muſt not diſparage the *Deed of conveyance* by which it came into their hands, by lending it ſparingly.

Let theſe Eſſayiſts however borrow in their turn, an Apology for making ſo free with the old Gentlewoman, (now when ſo many are endeavouring to perſuade us that ſhe hath loſt her Teeth and her nails) from the incomparable and truly Proteſtant Biſhop FLEETWOOD, of which they claim the full benefit, as being not the leſs adapted to the circumſtances of the Times, in the year 1773, than it was in the year 1713.

"This I hope will juſtify the preſent "undertaking" [meaning, his Life of St Wenefrid] "and ſhew, it is not altoge- "ther unſeaſonable for a Proteſtant to be "a little zealous for his religion alſo, when "ſuperſtition has ſo many votaries. I did "not indeed think, a few years ago, that "one ſhould have wanted an Apology for "ſpeaking or writing againſt Popery, in "any branch of it. I looked upon it as a "conſtant enemy, a ſtanding force always "in readineſs to fall upon us, and ſworn "in a manner to our Deſtruction, and

"there

" therefore that we were, as good Prote-
" ſtants, obliged to be upon our guard
" continually, and to annoy them all we
" could. But there has been ſince that,
" ſo marvellous a ſilence, and ſo profound
" a ſecurity in that reſpect, that to betray
" any fears of its returning now, is not
" only a mark, it ſeems, of a weak un-
" derſtanding, and little inſight into pub-
" lic matters, but alſo (if you will believe
" ſome men) of ill deſign, and diſaffection
" to Government. But I confeſs I cannot
" carry my reſpect ſo far to any govern-
" ment, as to believe we are ſecure, be-
" cauſe ſome people tell us ſo, againſt the
" alarms our ſenſes daily give us to the
" contrary. I cannot chuſe but think,
" that this ſecurity itſelf is one of our
" worſt ſymptoms. Whether the *wolves*
" bargain with the *dogs*, to hold their
" tongues, or whether they bark not out
" of fear, or lazineſs, or complaiſance, the
" flock, I think, is not a jot the ſafer.
" The enemy we have to deal with, grows
" more numerous, is active, vigilant, and
" daring, daily puſhes on his conqueſts,
" is in good heart, and under no diſcou-
" ragement but that of Laws; rejoices in

"our unconcernedneſs, confirms us in "our indolence, and tells us, if we ſuſpect "him we are unreaſonable. And for theſe "reaſons, I ſhould be glad to ſee men "ſomewhat more afraid of their invete-"rate enemy, talk ſomewhat louder a-"gainſt Popery, both from the pulpit and "the preſs, and tell the people that if that "ſuperſtition ever ſettles here upon the "Throne, there is an end of their reli-"gion, liberty, and property, and every "thing that life is worth the living for." *Works.* Fol. p. 600.

Thus we play the fools with the time, and the ſpirits of the wiſe ſit in the clouds and mock us.

SHAKESPEARE.

A

COLLECTION

OF

Letters and Eſſays, &c.

LONDON CHRONICLE, *March* 5, 1768.

To the PRINTER.

SIR,

SOON after the *Free and Candid Diſquiſitions* appeared, it was aſked, on the behalf of the church, why, if the authors did not approve of the church's forms, they did not leave her, and join themſelves to ſome other congregation?

When the late excellent Dr. *Clayton*, Biſhop of Clogher, expoſtulated, in a preface to his *Eſſay on Spirit*, on the abſurdity of requiring aſſent and conſent to our church forms in their preſent ſtate; the queſtion was repeated, Why, if the Biſhop of Clogher cannot give his aſſent and conſent to thoſe forms, does he not reſign his preferments?

The ſame interrogatory hath more lately been put to the author of the *Confeſſional*, by a ſolemn writer of a letter to him; ſo that one might take it for granted, that this is the very thing that our vehement churchmen want and wiſh for in all thoſe who object to the blemiſhes of the church,

Hoc Ithacus velit, hoc magno mercentur Atridæ.

Well then; a worthy Gentleman, Mr. *Robertſon*, hath gratified them, and taken the ſtep they ſo earneſtly required of the others. And what has been the conſequence? Let *Mediocriter*'s letter in your Chronicle of Feb. 25, tell the ſhameful tale. The poor man is branded as having no ſettled principles, as omitting to read the other ſide, &c. As if it did not appear by his late learned *Attempt*, that he had read all ſides with the utmoſt candor and preciſion, and with more of each, than perhaps *Mediocriter* ever read any thing. Can there be a ſtronger inſtance of this than that he quotes the curious Mr. *Jones* on the Trinity?

With reſpect to the R. R. Prelate with whom Mr. *Robertſon* had to do, it does him no diſhonour, that he ſhould expreſs his ſorrow, that the laws obliged him to require ſuch forms. Other Prelates of the firſt diſtinction for learning and piety have expreſſed the ſame concern; far from entertaining the narrow-ſoul'd prejudices of this poor man, of whoſe ſenſe all mankind muſt *think meanly*, for attacking a man who hath made ſo ſubſtantial a ſacrifice of his temporal emoluments to the integrity of his truly chriſtian principles.

It is the hardeſt thing in the world to keep theſe orthodox men honeſt. "Mr. *Robertſon*," ſays *Mediocriter*, "goes on to remark, how the Biſhop

"*very*

" *very prudently* declined intereſting himſelf in his " affairs." And then procedes to defend his Lordſhip, as not bound to patroniſe *new notions*. Is this matter truly ſtated? Is there not ſomething goes before this in Mr. *Robertſon*'s anſwerto *Andrew Marvel*, that ought to have been taken into conſideration?—I forbear naming particulars. Let any unprejudiced man peruſe Mr. *Robertſon*'s letter; and then pronounce whether the words *very prudently*, are not properly introduced, by that worthy confeſſor.

But *Tout pour l'Egliſe*, is the faſhionable motto of the times. I will venture to ſay, a Tillotſon, a Burnet, an Hoadley, a Fowler, or a Fleetwood, would have diſpenſed with their *prudence*, and have ſhewn their commiſeration for this poor Gentleman's caſe in deeds as well as words. We have been lately told that even Bp. Butler, a man of a very different turn from the Prelates above-mentioned, allowed an handſome annuity to a diſſenting miniſter, who could not in conſcience intitle himſelf to his Lordſhip's favours of another ſort, by conforming to the church. His Lordſhip indeed was not *bound to this in prudence*; but ſtill he did it; nor does it appear that his Lordſhip was under any previous engagement to do it. Think of this, maſter *Mediocriter*, and ſave yourſelf as well as you can from the conſequences of your unchriſtian ſtrictures on the excellent, learned, and conſcientious Mr. Robertſon. I am,

Mr. Printer,

Your moſt humble ſervant,

ANHYPOCRITUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *March* 24, 1768.

IT is pleaſant enough to hear your correſpondent *Mediocriter* prate about other people's *deſpicable ſkill in languages*, who himſelf cannot read or ſpell a plain word, becauſe it happens to be printed in capitals. What pretty changes has he rung upon the words *Antihypocritus* and *Antihypocrita*, two barbarous terms of his own coining, and neither of them a ſtraw better than the other, and all to ſhew his ſkill in languages. But however, as he ſeems to belong to the family of old *Infallible*, he need not be in any pain for his *credit*; another letter againſt *ſeceders*, will make him a Scholar, a Gentleman, and what not.

What a pity it is that he ſhould not be beneficed in Monſieur *Buffon*'s country where there are ſo few *ſeceders*, and where ſo large and reſpectable a majority ſubſcribe without the leaſt ſcruple to the *Trent*-canons, Pope *Pius*'s creed, &c. and when they have done, turn about and do their reverence to the Crucifix or the Madona, figuring in wood or in metal, or upon canvas, juſt as it happens, the venerable eye-witneſſes of theſe ſolemn proceedings.

When a conceited wrong-headed man is got on the left-handed ſide of a queſtion, 'tis ſtrange to obſerve what abſurd pains he will take to keep himſelf there. No doubt but an abuſive letter, calculated to diſparage an honeſt, conſcientious man, an able ſcholar,

ſcholar, and a moſt candid writer; a man, whom *Mediocriter* himſelf (that he may have an opportunity of abuſing other people) is obliged to rank among the *children of light*,—no doubt but ſuch a letter muſt be *dictated in the genuine ſpirit of chriſtianity*. No doubt but the writer of ſuch a letter talks with a very good grace, and with great uniformity of character of the *irritability of ſeceders from eſtabliſhments*. Muſt not one long to ſee what ſuch a genius has to ſay of the Candid Diſquiſitions and the Confeſſional?

" With reluctance, he ſays, he takes notice of " my letter," and on my conſcience I believe him; for I doubt not but it gave him ſome private ſtings, a little more ſenſible than thoſe of a ſwarm of waſps, " whoſe muſic and impotence" he tells us, very philoſophically, " are quite equal." But I fear he will take notice of this reply with a little more reluctance, when he comes to find his own mortal criticiſms rebound upon his own pate, and the neceſſity he muſt henceforward be under of applying to an *occuliſt* when he has any thing to read, which is written or printed in capital letters.

However, I would willingly recover my credit with him, if it may be done upon any moderate terms: and to make one pace towards him, I will try to give him a tranſlation of the three Latin lines at the end of his letter:

" We high-churchmen the more we are encou-
" raged, and the leſs we are oppoſed, the worſe
" we grow. Whatever comes into the head of an
" high-church-man, he *will* bring about if he
" can; and ſo the church is but inriched or glori-
" fied, he never conſiders whether his impoſi-

" tions, his projects and plans of power, are agree-
" able either to the gospel he outwardly professes,
" or to the real good of his country.*"

I am, &c.

ANHYPOCRITUS.

ST. JAMES'S CHRONICLE, *April* 2, 1768.

To the PRINTER.

SIR,

BISHOP Burnet, speaking of the trial of Stephen Colledge, called the Protestant Joiner, in 1681, says, that " the behaviour of the Judge who " tried him was such, that had he lived to see an " impeaching parliament, he might probably have " felt the ill effects of it." Without dwelling on the particulars of this unfortunate Joiner's case, my design is to take the hint from the Bishop's observation, to enlarge a little on the benefits of an impeaching parliament to an injured people.

The sycophants of the present times, the chips of the old block of 1681, will undoubtedly say, " We have no such delinquents among us now. " What occasion then for an impeaching parlia-
" ment?"

My

* The lines alluded to are the following:

Nam deteriores omnes sumus licentia,
Quodcunque inciderit in mentem, volet, neque id
Putabit pravum an rectum fiet quod petet.

TERENT.

My anſwer is, Examine the mutual accuſations of the ſeveral ſucceſſive adminiſtrations during the laſt ſeptennium; deny, if you can, that the people of Great Britain are deeply intereſted in the condemnation or acquittal of the men on whom theſe accuſations are laid. The people have a right, if ever they had it ſince they were a free people, to have juſtice done upon delinquents, repreſented on the one ſide, and on the other, to have been ſo flagitious in their ſeveral departments. Parliamentary impeachments are the propereſt, becauſe the conſtitutional means of bringing to light the malignant deeds of darkneſs, ſaid to be perpetrated by different parties, and of inflicting puniſhment on the detected authors and inſtruments of them. And the inquiries uſually previous to impeachments would eaſily direct that auguſt body to the proper objects of national reſentment; and I will make no ſcruple to ſay, that they would be employed in ſuch diſquiſitions and proſecutions with as much dignity to themſelves, and as much benefit to their conſtituents, as in any matters that will come before them.

The people indeed will hardly be perſuaded to think well of proceedings, where the foundation is laid in the impunity of former offenders. Let the new meaſures be built upon the correction of what ſhall be found to be amiſs in the old ones. If the people appear to have been miſtaken, or unduly prejudiced in the judgment they have formed of obnoxious men, they will readily acquieſce in the final and impartial determination of the national repreſentative. They have always acquieſced in

it; and where the nation is properly repreſented, they will always do it.

In matters of fact, however, the people cannot eaſily be miſled. Some of theſe have been ſo notorious, that not even the meaneſt artificer in the kingdom can be ignorant of them. The houſe of a member of parliament ranſacked, his papers ſeized, his perſon impriſoned, and the means of his deliverance defeated by a trick, and all under an authority acknowledged to be incompetent and unwarranted by law.—The Colonies irritated by meaſures inconſiſtent with good policy, not to ſay common equity, and thoſe meaſures publicly avowed and defended by general maxims and arguments which ſtrike at the root of all public liberty, at home and abroad; a diſpenſing power contended for on one occaſion; and on another, Juries precluded from being Judges of law as well as fact, in caſes where the liberty, the property, the good name, and even the life of a fellow-ſubject, depend upon their verdict. Theſe, ſurely, are no ſecrets, even to the moſt incurious.

In another view, the people have been heard to aſk, by what means, or by whoſe encouragement, papiſts have appeared, and have had acceſs to places where the leaſt tincture of their principles muſt be dangerous and menacing to the proteſtant ſettlement of the Crown, and to the gracious and amiable Head that wears it? They have been heard to aſk, by what authority a popiſh Biſhop was ſent to *Canada?* By what law a character of that kind is continued there? To whom is it owing that ſo vaſt a number of popiſh miſſionaries, in all ſorts of diſguiſes, abound in all parts of England?

That

That their ſucceſs in making converts is ſo very great, and the oppoſition to them ſo very inſignificant, and next to nothing?

Again, by whom, more lately, have certain modern ſtate inquiſitors been ſet up and abetted? Is it by mere chance that their harpy claws are firſt faſtened upon a family, ennobled, endeared to free *Britons*, and rendered illuſtrious by revolution ſervices? Will the flimſy cobwebs thrown over this attempt, conceal the owner of the talons which are ſtruck into this object, ſelected plainly for bearing enſigns inimical to the Houſe of Stuart?

This laſt circumſtance gives me the hint, that it would not miſbecome an impeaching parliament to give a look into the church, and take cogniſance of what doctrines have been current there, while deſpotic maxims have been ſo rife in politics. *Sacheverel* was a ſorry ignoramus, who had his cue and his cant from his party, to whom he was however, extremely ſerviceable. Let it be examined whether the very ſame doctrines he held, only more artfully covered, and more ambiguouſly expreſſed, may not be found among leading divines of the preſent day, who would be thought men of more conſequence? This, indeed, has ever been, and ever will be the caſe. *Stuartiſm* in politics will, of courſe, produce *Stuartiſm* in divinity: Should not a proteſtant parliament viſit for theſe things?

Is it a ſecret either who are, or have been the wicked inſtruments in theſe deſtructive doctrines, meaſures, counſels, or attempts? If it is, let an impeaching parliament aſk a few neceſſary queſtions, and it cannot long continue a ſecret. Let

thoſe who are diſcovered be called to account without reſpect of perſons; and though moſt of them poſſibly may have been only tools and underſtrappers, acting as occaſions have ariſen, and the cue has been given them by the grand prompter, yet there is little doubt but, to ſave their own bacon, they will to a man diſcover who ſet them to work. And however inconſiſtent theſe drudges of power may have been in theſe flagitious acts, with their own principles avowed on other occaſions; however they may have been at apparent enmity with each other, when they brought them forth; however they might be gratifying their own ſpite and malice, rather than purſuing the dictates of any ſettled principles, the fatal tendency of their doings to the liberty and ſafety of the Britiſh ſubject was juſt the ſame; and one thing we may be ſure of beforehand, that all theſe deſpotic, oppreſſive, papiſtical doctrines and practices have flowed from one and the ſame ſpring head; from ſome lurking grand puppet-maſter, whoſe principles have been in the higheſt degree unfriendly to the Britiſh conſtitution as eſtabliſhed upon a revolution baſis, and in every exhibition of his power and influence, uniformly and invariably ſo.

Pray then, good people, earneſtly and fervently pray, that the *grand puppet maſters* of the preſent generation may live to ſee an *impeaching parliament*, and may feel the ill effects of it to themſelves, and the bleſſed effects of it to you, to the uttermoſt. The only hope you have of ſtopping them in their career, is in ſuch a parliament. Such another ſeptennium, with ſuch a perfect impunity—and where

where will you be?* I was going to ſay, you have it in your power to *chooſe* an *impeaching parliament*. That perhaps is too late. But you certainly have it, and while you have a parliament, you will have it in your power to *make* it an *impeaching* parliament. Be unanimous in inſtructing your repreſentatives on this head. Be earneſt and alert in petitioning them in a body, for a national inquiry after delinquents. Fear not that innocent men can ſuffer by ſuch an inquiry. That auguſt aſſembly is in no danger of doing injuſtice in the way of impeachment. And depend upon it, they will not for ever be deaf to your ſpirited remonſtrances. In this work you muſt admit no favourites, no ſcreens, no compromiſes. Let the work be done without partiality and without hypocriſy. Point out the offences, your repreſentatives will know how to find out the offenders. They may, perhaps, come pretty ſoon at the maſter-criminal, and juſtice being done upon him, it may be ſufficient puniſhment for the reſt to live under the ſhame and contempt of the people, for having meanly ſubmitted to do *his* dirty work, even with the enſigns of Britiſh honour and dignity about them. Pray, good people, and unite all your endeavours to procure an *impeaching parliament*. I am,

Your affectionate friend,

And fellow-ſubject,

JOHN PYM.

LON-

* The end of this ſeptennium, is faſt approaching and then —Where ſhall we be indeed! O true *John Pym!*

LONDON CHRONICLE, *April* 7, 1768.

To the PRINTER.

SIR,

NOTHING, in my opinion, can be weaker, or more evaſive, than the Defence of a late tranſlation of *Jude* 4, in your Chronicle of *March* 29. The defender is angry with *Old Milton* for joining the words *Maſter God* with an hyphen, and ſays the tranſlator *viſibly* meant by, the *only Maſter God, God the only Maſter*, i. e. of the univerſe. But if ſo, why did not the tranſlator *make* his meaning *viſible*, by placing a comma after the word *Maſter?* Why does not his advocate take that method in this defence to ſave his client's meaning from the *low* and *ridiculous turn given to the expreſſion* by *Old Milton?* The truth is, and the defender ſeems to have been aware of it, that what the tranſlator would have gained on the one hand againſt Old Milton, by adding the comma, he might have loſt on the other, in the reputation of his orthodoxy; for it is very queſtionable whether by putting the comma as above-mentioned, he might not have ſet *Jude* at variance with *Athanaſius*, who muſt not be diſturbed, whatever becomes of the ſacred text. However, if the *comma* is not there, the *hyphen* muſt be. For the words, *Maſter God*, if not diſjoined by the comma, muſt be taken together, and that too in the very ſenſe that *Old Milton* puts upon them; and I make little

doubt

doubt but ſo the letter-writer meant it at firſt, (for the reaſon given above) without reflecting on the abſurdity, till the ſaid *Old Milton* ſuggeſted it to him. The defender of the tranſlation endeavours to find a ſubterfuge in *Malachi* i. 6. *If I be a Maſter, where is my fear?* But, alas for his diſtreſs! the Greek word there is not δεσποτης, but κυριος, anſwering to the Hebrew *Adonai*, which once more blocks up the way to his client's eſcape, and leaves him to the juſt correction of *Old Milton*. With the reſt of the controverſy I ſhould not concern myſelf, but that the defender puffs out the letter-writer's* comparative *mildneſs* towards the author of the Confeſſional; concerning which I can only judge from ſome extracts from his *firſt* letter, in the Monthly Review for *February* laſt, which ſeem to breathe the *mildneſs* of an inquiſitor, humbly beſeeching the ſecular magiſtrate to have mercy on the heretic, whom himſelf had prejudged by evidence of his own tutoring. I have been told indeed, that more than one hand was concerned in theſe two letters. If ſo, the tranſlator of *Jude* 4. might be the *milder* man of the two, tho' conſidering what uſe he makes of the whole paſſage, that may be a moot point, which I leave to thoſe who may have an intereſt in the deciſion. Be that as it may, I do not ſee how they who contend for powers and rights in a church called *proteſtant*, which are not warranted by the ſcripture (which, after all the facts and fair arguments mentioned by the defender, will, I apprehend, prove to be the caſe with the writer or writers

* *Vid.* The *Firſt* of Three Letters to the Author of the Confeſſional, aſcribed to Archbiſhop *Secker*.

writers of the two letters) can acquit themſelves of the charge of writing *for* popery.

I am, &c.

CANTABRIGIENSIS.

April 2, 1768.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *April* 14, 1768.

IN your Chronicle of *March* 26, I met with an extract from Dr *Blackſtone*'s View of the Parliament of Great Britain, wherein it is aſſerted that, "It is a branch of the royal prerogative that NO "parliament CAN be convened by its own autho- "rity, or by the authority of ANY except the King "ALONE." Upon what law, or upon what muniments this prerogative is founded, the Dr. does not inform us, but contents himſelf with enumerating ſeveral inconveniences, which in his own imagination, might ariſe if the King alone ſhould *not* be inveſted with this prerogative.

I ſay, *in his own imagination*, as appears by the ſtatute which he himſelf quotes, *viz.* 16 Car. I. chap. 1. wherein "a power is given to the peers "of this realm, if the King neglected to call a "parliament for three years, to aſſemble and iſſue "writs for the chuſing one, and in caſe of neglect

"of

" of the peers, the conſtituents might meet and " elect one themſelves." " But this," ſays the Dr. " if ever put in practice, would have been " liable to all the inconveniences, I have juſt now " ſtated."

That is to ſay, " the peers would have been ig- " norant at what place they were to aſſemble, nei- " ther would the commons choſen by their writs, " have known either the time or place of their " meeting, notwithſtanding ſufficient proviſion for " this knowledge was, or at leaſt might have been " made in the act, even though, through the ne- " glect of the peers, the chuſing of a parliament " had devolved immediately on the conſtituents; " and laſtly, it would have been diſputable whe- " ther the members who met, or the members who " abſented themſelves, were really the legiſlative " body." Theſe are the inconveniences enume- rated by the learned Doctor, in ſtating of which, he ſeems to have depended as much on the want of common ſenſe in his readers, as his argument does on the ſuppoſed ignorance of the lords and commons.

But, it ſeems this act was repealed by the ſtatute 16 Car. II. cap. 1. (ſo the numbers ſtand in your Chronicle) not however on account of theſe in- conveniences, but, according to the Doctor, " be- " cauſe it was eſteemed ſo highly detrimental and " injurious to the royal prerogative." And from hence he concludes, that no precedent can be drawn from the ſtatute of Car. I.

What! not though this branch of the preroga- tive royal was for ſo many years under the controul of this ſtatute? And does it afford no precedent

that

that all his fancied inconveniences are but ſmoke and vapour?

But let us now look at the conſequences of this repeal. The prerogative royal being thus reſtored, King Charles II. and after him King James II. found themſelves at liberty to govern without parliaments at certain intervals, during which the *detriment* and *injury* to the people were unſpeakable. Why would not our commentator deſcant a little upon theſe inconveniences? Plainly becauſe he thought, if the prerogative royal ſuffered no detriment or injury, it was no matter what detriment or injury aroſe from the exerciſe of it, to the public. It was of no conſequence to the conſtitution, provided the claims of the prerogative were aſcertained and admitted, that an oppreſſed and injured people were put out of a poſſibility of relieving themſelves againſt the violences and encroachments of arbitrary power.

Happily for us the good people of England did not think at the revolution, as this patron of D———m. He himſelf acknowledges that, at that period, "The Lords and Commons by their "own authority, and upon the ſummons from the "Prince of *Orange*, met in a convention, and "therein diſpoſed of the crown and kingdom."

Without inquiring how the Lords and Commons came to know *when* and *where* to convene, or what the Doctor means by *diſpoſing of the kingdom*, I would only aſk, from whence the Lords and Commons derived this authority as their own? "From the vacancy of the throne," ſays the Doctor, "which created a neceſſity, or at leaſt the "*apprehenſion* of a neceſſity, that they ſhould meet "to fill it."

Pretty

Pretty trifling enough. The *apprehenſion* of a neceſſity! Was that ſufficient to give them authority to convene, and to diſpoſe of the crown and kingdom? If ſo the *apprehenſion*, of a neceſſity in *other* caſes may give them the like authority, for moſt aſſuredly not one of them knew before they convened, that the throne was actually vacant.

Would any other man in the kingdom, who hath read the debates of that convention, and conſidered the arguments on both ſides of that queſtion *before* the throne was *declared* by the members of the convention to be *vacant*, have ventured to aſſert, as the Doctor does, that "the "vacancy of the throne was *precedent* to their "meeting without a royal ſummons; and *not* the "*conſequence* of it?" Might not he as well have clinched the matter at once, and affirmed that the filling the throne with the Prince of *Orange* was *precedent* to the convention, and not the *conſequence* of it, and then have inferred, in favour of the prerogative, that the convention did not meet without the royal ſummons? Would not one of theſe aſſertions be as true as the other? And does not the expedient propoſed in that convention, of a *Regent* who ſhould act in the name of King *James* during his natural life, effectually confute them both? The reſult is, that the throne was *not* vacant till the convention *declared* it to be vacant; and the act of 1 Will. and Mary, confirming the determination of that convention, authoriſes us to ſay, that the Lords and Commons then met in convention without the royal authority, were, and would have been "*really* the two houſes of par-"liament, notwithſtanding the want of writs, or

"other

" other defects of form," whether they had judged the throne to be vacant or not.

" But this, the Doctor tells us, and likewise the " similar case at the restoration of Charles II. were " justifiable only on a principle of *necessity*." We acknowledge it, and of a necessity of which we hope never to see another instance, unless these high prerogative men should get so far into court credit, as to dispose some of our future monarchs to act as Charles I. and James II. did. Of this, thanks to heaven, (but none to such Doctors) there are no grounds for the remotest apprehension during this generation. And should such necessity be once more the curse of our posterity, they will, we may be sure, avail themselves of these precedents, and not suffer the door of relief to be shut against them by such flimsy inconsistent reasonings as these we have been reviewing.

I desire it may be understood that I am arguing only against these reasonings. I enter not into the extent or limits of the prerogative royal. It is sufficent that parliaments in due season are secured to us by the legislature, by whomsoever or howsoever they are to be called: and the Doctor had done as wisely to have left the whole matter upon that foundation, without entering into a disquisition, which can answer no end but to raise the jealousy of the public by a decision which at some periods of our history would not have been unattended with inconveniences to the writer.

I am, &c.

A Temple Student.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *April* 23, 1768.

CAN any man wonder that popery increaſes ſo faſt, who makes the leaſt obſervation upon the encouragement given by ſome in the church of England to the moſt exceptionable part of it, I mean its *idolatry?* Let any one read the account in the *Gazetteer* of Oct. 21, of the altar-piece in a chapel newly opened for divine worſhip, and then conſider, whether, ſo far as a picture can do it, a poor ignorant proteſtant will want any farther incitement to worſhip the elegant figure of the Virgin Mary there exhibited, than the raptures expreſſed by the letter-writer in contemplating the exquiſite workmanſhip.

I take it for granted, that my Lords the Biſhops have a power of excluding ſuch ſcandals from places of proteſtant worſhip, and of ſeverely cenſuring thoſe who introduce them. I make no ſcruple to call this a ſcandal to weak proteſtants, as I have been aſſured by a Gentleman who has travelled, that this picture is an exact copy of ſeveral popiſh altar-pieces he has ſeen abroad. Why is it not then removed, and rather conſigned to the flames, than ſuffered to remain where it ſerves the papiſts to confute every argument a church-of-England-man can urge againſt image-worſhip, as they explain it? Is it placed there merely to entertain the connoiſſeurs in painting? If not, for what

what purpoſe is it there exhibited? Will the reverend divine, whoſe fulſome praiſes are trumpeted forth in the beginning of the letter, ſay, that it is put there as a memorial to pious chriſtians of the gracious event it is deſigned to repreſent? Why ſo ſay the papiſts of the very groſſeſt of all their repreſentative images. And what ſay the proteſtants in anſwer? Do not they tell them, that admit what they ſay to be true as to the *intention* (though ſuch memorials can never be wanted by the *ſpiritual* worſhipper) the ſimple-minded, uninformed chriſtian will certainly imagine it was put there for a more ſolemn purpoſe, namely, that of adoration, and will practiſe accordingly.

I am an utter ſtranger to the Gentleman who is ſaid to have opened this chapel in ſo very *animating* and *pathetic* a manner. I am ſo far from having heard his performances, that I never ſet my eyes on his perſon; but had he the tongue of men and of angels, if he was acceſſary to the ſetting up of this ſuperſtitious picture, I would neither give him the hearing myſelf, nor adviſe any wavering proteſtant to attend him, as nothing in the world can be more contrary to the doctrine of the church of England, taught in her homilies againſt *the peril of idolatry*, than ſuch offenſive pictures placed ſo near to a promiſcuous company of ſerious people, joining, upon their knees, in the moſt ſolemn act of chriſtian communion.

Were a mahometan to come into the chapel at ſuch a time, might he not ſay with the greateſt appearance of reaſon, "If thoſe people are not "worſhipping thoſe images of *Gabriel* and *Mary*, "what are they doing." This however, to the grief

grief of all ſincere proteſtants, is not the only ſcandalous object of its kind in and about this *proteſtant* metropolis. They abound in every quarter of it.

It is ſaid, that ſome time ago ſome conſcientious Church-wardens endeavoured to prevent the putting up ſome ſcandalous paintings in a church not far from the metropolis;* wherein I am told they were not only oppoſed, but even ridiculed by ſome of the clergy; a circumſtance which perſuades me, that this exhibition in *C*—— ſtreet has had no ſanction from the Right Reverend Paſtor in whoſe juriſdiction the chapel ſtands.

Being ſome little time ago in a Bookſeller's ſhop, a book was handed to me by a Gentleman preſent, intituled, *Comfort for the afflicted under every diſtreſs*. I was deſired at the ſame time to obſerve a copper-plate print before it, which repreſented a perſon in the full habit of a clergyman of the eſtabliſhed church, ſtanding before a weeping female, and pointing to a crucifix, behind her attended with all the concomitants uſually ſeen in many of the popiſh books of devotion, from ſome of which I make no doubt but it was copied, ſave only that the gown and caſſock was ſubſtituted for the frock and cowl. I ſhall poſſibly be told, there are crucifixes and other pictures in our common-prayer books. It is true. But by what authority? And whence were they copied at firſt, but from maſs-books? And what edification do they yield

* See a pamphlet, intituled, *Ornaments of Churches conſidered*, &c. printed at OXFORD, 1761. A work fitter for the pen of a popiſh prieſt than of a Doctor of the proteſtant church of England.

yield to the proteſtant worſhipper? Many of them, I am perſuaded, ſerve only to miſlead the apprehenſion of the ſimple and ignorant chriſtian, with reſpect to ſome incidents in the goſpel-hiſtory, which are in theſe prints moſt groſly miſrepreſented. None of them, however, that I have ſeen, exhibit an apoſtle pointing to a crucifix, as a means of relief to a diſtreſſed diſciple; becauſe, as it happens, there is no paſſage in the New Teſtament that can even be wreſted to countenance ſuch an inſtance of fanatical ſuperſtition.

But to convince your readers in how little agreement this kind of pageantry is, either in our books or churches, with the principles and diſcipline of our church even in the infancy of our reformation, I beg leave to preſent them with a curious dialogue between Queen *Elizabeth* and Dr. *Nowel*, Dean of *St. Paul*'s, as it is publiſhed by Mr. *Strype*, Annals of Qu. *Eliz.* p. 238, premiſing, that the ſaid Dean had cauſed a new ſervice book, adorned with cuts and pictures of ſaints and martyrs, &c. to be laid on her Majeſty's cuſhion, inſtead of one which had no pictures.

" *Queen.* Mr. Dean how came it to paſs that a " new ſervice book was placed on my cuſhion?

" *Dean.* May it pleaſe your Majeſty, I caus'd " it to be placed there.

Q. Wherefore did you ſo?

" *D.* To preſent your Majeſty with a new-year's " gift.

" *Q.* You could never preſent me with a worſe.

" *D.* Why ſo, Madam?

" *Q.* You know I have an averſion to *idolatry*, " to images and pictures of this kind.

" *D.* Wherein is the idolatry, may it pleaſe " your Majeſty?

" *Q.*

" *Q.* In the cuts reſembling *angels* and *ſaints*, " nay groſſer abſurdities, pictures reſembling the " bleſſed trinity.

" *D.* I meant no harm; nor did I think it " would offend your Majeſty, when I intended it " for a new-year's gift.——

" *Q.* You muſt needs be ignorant then. Have " you forgot our proclamation againſt images, " pictures, and Romiſh relicks in the churches? " Was it not read in your deanry?

" *D.* It was read, but be your Majeſty aſſured " I meant no harm when I cauſed the cuts to be " bound in the ſervice book.

" *Q.* You muſt needs be very ignorant to do " this after our prohibition of them.

" *D.* It being my ignorance, your Majeſty may " the better pardon me.

" *Q.* I am ſorry for it; yet glad to hear it was " your *ignorance* rather than your *opinion*.

" *D.* Be your Majeſty aſſured it was my igno- " rance.

" *Q.* If ſo, Mr. *Dean*, God grant you his ſpi- " rit, and more wiſdom for the future.

" *D.* Amen, I pray God.

" *Q.* Pray let no more of theſe *miſtakes*, or *of* " *this kind* be committed within the churches of " this realm, for the future.

" *D.* There ſhall not."

Shall we, with this worthy Dean, plead *ignorance* in excuſe for this great alteration among us, or ſhall we put our juſtification upon the foot of *opinion?* I am, &c.

A Clergyman of the Eſtabliſhed Church of England.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *April* 28, 1768.

MY good couſin *Oxonienſis* ſeems to be a little ſhy in reſolving us, whether the words, *Maſter God*, Jude 4, are to be coupled by a hyphen, or diſjoined by a comma. He tells us, that the words, *Lord God*, in the common tranſlation have no comma. But the queſtion is, what the letter-writer's tranſlation *requires*. His laſt advocate explained his ſenſe thus, *God the only maſter of the univerſe*. Which, taken in the ſame order that the words lie in the text, ſhould certainly be written and printed, *the only maſter of the univerſe, God*, and then I ſhould deſire *Oxonienſis* would inform us, how the following words, *And our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, added to them, will ſquare with *Athanaſius?* The words, *Lord God*, in the preſent text, were never meant by the tranſlators to be thus diſjoined, as appears by the appellation *Lord God*, being ſo often employed by them, to denote the Supreme Being in the Old Teſtament, as well as in the New; and though the hyphen is not marked, it ought to be, and the words are univerſally underſtood as if it were, in all thoſe paſſages where they occur. In 1 Pet. iii. 15. we have, *ſanctify the Lord God in your hearts*. Should any one take it into his head to tranſlate this, *ſanctify the Maſter God in your hearts*; would any man imagine that the tranſlator could poſſibly mean to have the words, *Maſter God*, read diſ-

disjunctively? The case is just the same with the passage in *Jude*, and *Oxonienſis* is wise enough to perceive what effect the placing a comma between the two words, would have, and therefore, notwithstanding the interpretation above-mentioned absolutely requires it, he endeavours to lead us off, to something else that we may not think of it. He refers me to some translation of this passage of *Jude*, "which, he says, is despised by my friends, as "orthodox." How he comes to be so well acquainted with my friends I know not, nor what translation he means. But I know of a various reading, of this place, supported by good authorities, and approved by *Grotius* and the Doctors *Mill* and *Hammond*, which would leave no room for this ridiculous translation of the letter-writer. It should seem however as if *Oxonienſis* thought this apocryphal translation he refers me to, *more* orthodox than that in our English Bible: and so, I suspect, thought the letter-writer, and therefore attempted to accommodate matters by introducing his *Master God*, in which he had but very meagre luck. *Oxonienſis* argues, that if the word, *Master*, is proper in *Malachi*, it *may be* proper in *Jude*. But I have shewn that it is improper in *Malachi*, and it was so much to the purpose to shew this, that it totally deprived the letter-writer of the benefit of escaping from *Old Milton*'s just animadversion, by taking refuge in that text. Whatever effect the letter-writer's censures may have upon *Old Milton*, of whom I have no knowledge, I can assure my academical cousin, that though the zealous efforts of honest impotence may sometimes make me smile, they never make me angry. He seems

to hint, that the letter-writer knows of no temporal arm to whom the author of the Confeſſional may be delivered. I ſhould certainly hope that the letter-writer's knowledge in this matter, proceeds from a conſciouſneſs that the ſaid author has given no offence to the temporal arm, if the letter-writer had not charged him with denying the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, an hereſy that ſurely deſerves excommunication, which in theſe days I fear, would be a mere *Brutum Fulmen*, but for a certain writ called a *Capias*, which I am told iſſues out of a temporal court. Surely *Oxonienſis* could not mean that the letter-writer knows the temporal arm has no buſineſs to interfere in eccleſiaſtical cauſes!—And yet I have heard a whiſper that there is ſomething in a certain *ſecond letter** that ſquints that way. Theſe little *doublings* ſeem to confirm the notion that theſe letters are the work of more than one head and one pair of hands, and render it poſſible that the *execration of the victim* might come from *one* operator, and the *tears* ſhed over him from *another*; time may diſcover much, and to that grand devellopper let us leave it.

I am,

SIR,

Your humble ſervant,

CANTABRIGIENSIS.

ST.

* See *A ſecond Letter* to the Author of *the Confeſſional.*

ST. JAMES'S CHRONICLE, *Auguſt* 9, 1768.

To the PRINTER.

SIR,

ANSWERS to the following queries from any of your ingenious correſpondents learned in the law, will much oblige ſome of your conſtant readers, and particularly your friend,

The CURRIER.

I. Whether a culprit, proſecuted originally by the Attorney General, has it in his power, upon the demiſe of the ſaid Attorney General *pendente lite* to fill up the vacancy?

II. Whether there is any *neceſſity* that the poſt of Attorney General ſhould be kept vacant, even for twenty-four hours?

III. Whether the culprit ought to ſuffer by the means of an impropriety which he could not help, but which might have been helped by the proſecutor?

IV. Whether there is no impropriety in adjudging a culprit to a year's impriſonment, which is not to commence till ten months after paſſing the ſentence?

V. Whether a verdict of acquittal upon an indictment for murder is abſolutely *final?*

VI. Whether the next of kin, or the heir at law of the deceaſed, may not appeal againſt ſuch verdict?

VII. Whether there are not precedents in our law books, of the admiſſibility of ſuch appeals, and of new trials had thereupon? And whether there are not inſtances upon record of murderers being convicted on a ſecond trial, who were acquitted on the firſt?*

Auguſt 13, 1768.

About this time died Dr. Thomas Secker, *Archbiſhop of* Canterbury, *concerning whoſe character, the world entertained very different ſentiments. As ſome papers will occur in the courſe of theſe Eſſays relating to the ſaid Prelate, it has been thought proper to premiſe the following character of his Grace from the London Chronicle of Auguſt* 13, 1768.

DR. Secker, the late Archbiſhop of Canterbury, was the eldeſt ſon of a Gentleman of a ſmall fortune in Nottinghamſhire, bred at the free ſchool of Cheſterfield in Derbyſhire, became an intimate friend of Mr. Benſon, and Mr. Butler, (ſince Biſhops of Glouceſter and Durham) at the academy in Glouceſterſhire, and applied himſelf afterwards to the ſtudy of phyſic, which he purſued five years at London, Paris, and Leyden, and at the laſt place took the degree of M. D. in March 1720, where he became acquainted with the Rev. Edw. Talbot, who, on his return to England, introduced him to his father, then Biſhop of Durham: But changing the courſe of his ſtudies,

* Theſe *queries* relate to the ſentence paſſed upon Mr. Wilkes, and the acquital of Belſ and Macquirk.

ſtudies, he entered himſelf of Exeter College, Oxford, in April 1721; took orders, and was made domeſtic Chaplain to Biſhop Talbot in 1722; received from him the rich rectory of Houghton-le-ſpring in 1723; married the ſiſter of Dr. Benſon in 1725, (who died in March 1748) and exchanged his rectory for that of Ryton, near Newcaſtle, and a Prebend of Durham in 1727. In 1723 he went out Grand Compounder in the univerſity of Oxford for the degree of M. A. and on the 5th of July 1733, took the degree of L. L. D. and on the 8th of that month preached the ſermons at the Public Act, being a few months before appointed to the rectory of St. James's, on the promotion of Dr. Tyrwhit, to be a Reſidentiary of St. Paul's. The reſt of his Grace's preferments, &c. we mentioned in a former paper.

His Grace was buried, purſuant to his own deſire, in the paſſage from the garden door of his palace to the north door of the pariſh church at Lambeth, and has forbidden any monument or epitaph to be placed for him any where.

By his will he has left all his options, as they become vacant, to be diſpoſed of by the Archbiſhop of Canterbury, the Biſhop of London, and the Biſhop of Wincheſter, for the time being, in truſt for them to give each option to that perſon, to whom they ſhall in their conſciences think it would have been moſt reaſonable and proper for him to give it, had it fallen in his Grace's lifetime; he has appointed Dr. Daniel Burton and Mrs. Catharine Talbot, (daughter of the Rev. Mr. Edward Talbot, mentioned above) his executors, and given 1000 l. to be diſtributed among his ſervants,

in ſuch manner as Mrs. Talbot and her daughter Mrs. Catharine Talbot ſhall think fit: Has left thirteen thouſand pounds in three per cent. annuities, to Dr. Porteus and Dr. Stinton, his chaplains, in truſt, that they pay the intereſt thereof to Mrs. Talbot and her daughter, during their joint lives, or the life of the ſurvivor of them, and after the deceaſe of both thoſe Ladies, then eleven thouſand of the ſaid thirteen thouſand pounds are to be transferred to the following charitable purpoſes:

	l.	s.	d.
To the ſociety for propagation of the goſpel in foreign parts, for the general uſes of the ſociety	1000	0	0
To the ſaid ſociety, towards the eſtabliſhment of a Biſhop, or Biſhops, in the King's dominions in America,	1000	0	0
To the ſociety for promoting chriſtian knowledge — —	500	0	0
To the Iriſh proteſtant working ſchools	500	0	0
To the corporation of the widows and children of the poor clergy	500	0	0
To the ſociety of the ſtewards of the ſaid charity, — —	200	0	0
To Bromley College in Kent —	500	0	0
To the hoſpitals of the Archbiſhop of Canterbury at Croydon, St. John at Canterbury, and St. Nicholas Harbledown, 500 l. each —	1500	0	0
To St. George's and London hoſpitals, and the lying-in hoſpital in Brownlow-ſtreet, 500 l. each	1500	0	0

To the aſylum in the pariſh of Lambeth — —	400	0	0
To the Magdalen hoſpital, the Lock hoſpital near Hide Park Corner, and the ſmall-pox and inoculation hoſpital, to each of which his Grace was a ſubſcriber, 300l. each —	900	0	0
To the incurables at St. Luke's hoſpital — — —	500	0	0
Towards the repairing or rebuilding of houſes belonging to poor livings in the dioceſe of Canterbury	2000	0	0
	11000	0	0

His Grace has left great part of his library to the public library at Lambeth, and after the payment of ſome other legacies, has left his real and the reſidue of his perſonal eſtate to his nephew, Mr. Thomas Froſt, of Nottingham.

Among the many excellent charities of the late Archbiſhop of Canterbury, the new chapel at Stockwell was one, (at which place his Grace preached his laſt ſermon, from Joſhua xxiv. verſe 15.) he being a great promoter of that building, towards which he was a noble benefactor, beſides his gift of the communion plate, which will be a laſting monument to his Grace's memory.

ST. JAMES'S CHRONICLE, *Aug.* 20, 1768.

To the PRINTER.

SIR,

IT is well known to the learned, what vaſt advantage hath accrued to the republic of letters from the various readings, ſuggeſted by critical adepts, in different branches of literature. Not only the claſſic authors, ancient hiſtorians and philoſophers, but even the apoſtles and evangeliſts, are ſuppoſed to have been greatly illuminated and beautified by the ſeaſonable ſubſtitution of one word for another. Theſe learned labours go under the name of *caſtigations*, and not improperly, particularly where, as it may ſometimes happen, a worſe word is ſubſtituted for a better. I know of no ſchool or academy in Europe, where this *Ars Critica* has not been for ages in the higheſt repute, ſave only in the ſchool of William Rufus, where, it ſeems, this ſpecies of improvement has been retarded from a ſilly ſcruple, that the literature thoſe academicians deal in, is matter of record, as if any records ought to be more ſacred than thoſe of the New Teſtament! I am informed, however, that ſome ſucceſsful attempts have been lately made in that ancient ſeminary to introduce the practice,* and that there are ſome hopes it may in no long time become general. One other objection

* Alluding to the ſubſtitution of one word for another in a legal proceſs by the Maſter Critic in that ſchool of Juriſprudence.

jection has indeed been made to such alterations in that department, which is, that the manuscripts they study concern *meum* and *tuum*, and oftentimes the life or the liberty of a free subject, and therefore ought not to undergo any change but by consent of parties, which may not always be easy to be had; and it has been urged, that such alterations may prove to be, not so much *castigations* of the record, as of the person interested in it, as tending to his condemnation before the merits of his cause are heard. In my humble opinion, this is an objection of no weight or strength. Nothing is of more authority in Rufus's school than precedents, and what more common than to find a leading critic pronouncing, *Sic scribas meo periculo, tametsi reclamantibus ominibus codicibus.* And what is the noise of a paltry Attorney and his client to the thundering reclamations of perhaps an hundred folio volumes. I am,

SIR, &c.

Aristarchus Pelliculatus.

For the LONDON CHRONICLE.

Aug. 20, 1768.

Some remarks on the account given of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, in Lond. Chron. August 13.

DR. *Secker* is said "to have been the eldest son "of a Gentleman of a small fortune in Not-"tinghamshire."—— I am persuaded he was born

at Chesterfield; for above sixty years ago his father was a *Shopkeeper* in Chesterfield; there he lived, as I have been informed, when this son was at that free-school; and was a protestant dissenter of a fair and reputable character: and I personally knew his eldest son Thomas, when he first came from Mr. Jones's academy at Tewksbury; have been witness to his great intimacy with Mr. *Bates* a protestant dissenting minister, on whose ministry he attended during the time he resided at Mr. *Samuel Wildbore*'s, a dyer in Brewhouse-yard, Nottingham, who married his sister; the which sister, after Mr. *Wildbore*'s death, married Mr. *Frost*; to whose son Thomas, he, the Archbishop, has left a residue of his real and personal estate.

The two first articles inserted of his public charities, are one thousand pounds for the general use of the society for propagating the gospel—and one thousand pounds towards the establishment of an American Bishop:—this latter bequest occasioned in me some reflexions; which are as follow:—The Archbishop had a dissenting education, was designed for the pulpit among that people; but had not so much freedom from doubtings, as to allow him to engage in the service of a public instructor in the christian religion; and therefore turned his thoughts to the study of physic. Bishop *Talbot*'s arguments reconciled him to the faith of the civil church establishment, in April, 1721, and he became more and more confirmed in that faith, as he made his advances in the church, till he reached the See of Canterbury. When Bishop of Oxford, he opened himself at St. Mary-le-Bow, Feb. 20, 1741, when he gave such a shocking account of our

our American colonies — " the European inhabi-
" tants there being private adventurers, neither
" numerous, nor rich, nor certain of ſucceſs, nor
" unanimous in belief, eſtabliſhed in ſeveral pro-
" vinces no form whatever of public worſhip and
" inſtruction. Too many of them carried but lit-
" tle ſenſe of chriſtianity abroad with them: a
" great part of the reſt ſuffered it to wear out
" gradually: and their children grew of courſe to
" have yet leſs than they: till in ſome countries
" there were ſcarce any footſteps of it left, beyond
" the mere name.—Such was the ſtate of things in
" more of our colonies than one: and where it was
" a little better, it was however lamentably bad."

I have read the North American defences, and am not able to find any foundation for this charge; nor any advantages the Northern colonies have received by the epiſcopal miſſions*.

The Biſhop adds indeed, " at preſent much re-
" mains to be done. Multitudes continue, as be-
" fore, in a thoughtleſs diſregard to almoſt every
" part of chriſtianity: and multitudes alſo are daily
" petitioning for help."—Here are then multitudes of the one complexion put againſt multitudes of the other complexion. With me, verily, it is a queſtion whether the unpetitioning multitudes have not full as much regard to chriſtianity, as the petitioning multitudes have?

But the Biſhop will tell us, " that whoever is
" taught chriſtianity by our care, will be taught it
" as profeſſed in the church eſtabliſhed here by
" law."—In this ſenſe of chriſtianity, we muſt then

 allow

* Are the epiſcopized colonies of Maryland and Virginia more chriſtianized than thoſe of New York and New England?

allow the Northern colonies to contain multitudes who continue in a thoughtleſs diſregard to almoſt every part of chriſtianity. Thus he, and the other Biſhops, in viliſying and reproaching the American coloniſts, ſhelter themſelves under this fictitious idea of chriſtianity; monopolizing the religion of Chriſt within a fixed model of civil eſtabliſhment; confining chriſtianity to a ſet or party.

He farther pleads—Had they Biſhops, "it would "not bring their dependance on Great Britain into "any degree of that danger, which ſome perſons "profeſs to apprehend ſo ſtrongly on this occaſion, "who would make no manner of ſcruple about "doing other things much more likely to deſtroy "it: who are not terrified in the leaſt, that ſuch "numbers there reject the epiſcopal order entirely; "nor perhaps would be greatly alarmed, were ever "ſo many to reject religion itſelf."—A very extraordinary piece of repreſentation, which would inſinuate an eaſy natural tranſition from rejecting epiſcopacy to irreligion. With what face a man could ſay this, who could not but ſee that *epiſcopacy and religion* have no degree nor kind of connexion, in thouſands and ten thouſands of inſtances all around him. And who, when writing to a learned correſpondent, whom he knew did hold *Dioceſan Epiſcopacy* as indefenſible, "that he held him and "all men in eſteem, who love our Lord Jeſus "Chriſt in ſincerity." So he wrote, not many weeks before he died to a proteſtant diſſenter. The Archbiſhop muſt therefore have clearly ſeen, that religion, or chriſtianity, and epiſcopacy have no neceſſary connexion.

However, from the ſermon he preached Feb. 20,

1741,

1741, it appears, that the Biſhop of Oxford, Dr. *Secker*, furniſhed the declaimers againſt the North American colonies with the *root ideas* of defaming and epiſcopizing them.—His bequeſt of one thouſand pounds to this purpoſe, is a part of the uncarved Lambeth monument; and when we keep in our idea, three hundred pounds to the *Magdalen Hoſpital*, and three hundred pounds to the *Lock Hoſpital*—the mauſoleum figures much more ſtrongly, than the higheſt poliſhed decorated marble ever could.

A MAN OF OLD ENGLAND.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Auguſt* 20, 1768.

VARIOUS have been the ſpeculations upon the fracture of the late Archbiſhop's thigh-bone from ſo light a cauſe, eſpecially as his Grace's habit, his fits of the gout excepted, was eſteemed to be uncommonly healthy and even athletic. I ſhall not pretend to ſay which of the opinions, among the many I have heard, I would chuſe to eſpouſe: But ſhall only ſhew, from an inſtance in the Biographia Britannica, that the caſe is not ſingular: "Dr. Ralph Bathurſt had been blind "for ſome time, and his death was occaſioned by "the accident of breaking his thigh, while he was "walking in his garden; which, on the failure of "his eyes, became his favourite and only amuſe-"ment. Under this malady he languiſhed for ſe-"veral days in acute agonies. It is ſaid that at "firſt,

" firſt, and for ſome time, he refuſed to ſubmit " to the operation of the ſurgeon, declaring in his " tortures, that there was no marrow in the bones " of an old man." vol. vi. pt. 2d. Supplement p. 12. Dr. Bathurſt was himſelf an able Phyſician, and undoubtedly grounded his *declaration* upon his experience and obſervation; a circumſtance which makes the *ſurprize* of his Grace's medical aſſiſtants, ſpoken of in many of the public prints, a little unaccountable.

I am,

SIR,

Your conſtant reader,

A LICENTIATE.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Aug.* 27, 1768.

A Writer in your paper of Saturday laſt, who ſigns himſelf *a Man of Old England*, has taken upon him to doubt the truth of the late Archbiſhop's being " the ſon of a Gentleman of " a ſmall fortune in Nottinghamſhire," ſaying, " I " am perſuaded, he was born at Cheſterfield; for " above ſixty years ago his father was a *ſhopkeeper* " in Cheſterfield; there he lived, as I have been " informed, when this ſon was at the free ſchool " there," &c. In anſwer to this, it is ſufficient to ſay, that the words objected to are taken *verbatim* from a note on Bp. Butler's life in the Biographia Bri-

Britannica*, containing ſome particulars of Archbiſhop Secker, *communicated by himſelf:* And if theſe accounts vary, whether he or this anonymous Remarker knew beſt let the impartial judge! Though the father might have a ſmall fortune in Nottinghamſhire, and yet live at Cheſterfield, and have a ſon born and educated there. As to his being a *ſhopkeeper* (which this writer ſtyles him) or a *Gentleman*, that is of no conſequence any farther than as the Archbiſhop's veracity is concerned.

That Dr. Secker was deſigned for the pulpit among the diſſenters, will ſcarce be believed by thoſe who attend to his own words in the abovementioned note *(ſee below)*. Though ſurely he might have doubts as to the mode of worſhip among the diſſenters, which might prevent him from offering himſelf as a Miniſter among them, without being (as this writer repreſents him) a doubter in regard to chriſtianity in general; unleſs he would confine chriſtianity within the pale of the meeting-houſe. But how is this reconcileable with what is ſaid of his "attending on Mr. Bate-"ſon's miniſtry at Nottingham?" As to what is ſaid of "Biſhop Talbot's arguments," (meaning no doubt his prebendal ones) and the ſneer of the Archbiſhop's "advancing gradually in the faith "of the civil church eſtabliſhment till he reached "the

* See the ſupplement to that work (publiſhed in 1764) p. 23, note D. the Biographer adds, "I can aſſure the reader "Dr. Secker never took (as ſome have imagined) preſbyte-"rian orders, nor offered himſelf to be a diſſenting miniſter, "nor received the communion in any other than the church "of England."

"the ſee of Canterbury," ſuch illiberal imputations deſerve no anſwer but contempt.

A little farther another cauſe of complaint appears—the Archbiſhop's legacy of one thouſand pounds towards the eſtabliſhment of an American Biſhop:—*hinc illæ lachrymæ*! But, alas! of what manner of ſpirit can thoſe men be, who would deny the eſtabliſhed church thoſe privileges, that toleration, which they themſelves enjoy both in Europe and America; the privilege, I mean, of ordaining paſtors among themſelves without the hazard, expence and delay of being obliged to croſs the Atlantic for holy orders! That this is the principal object for which an American Biſhop is wiſhed and deſired, the Americans have been ſo repeatedly aſſured by the beſt authority, that ſcepticiſm itſelf can ſcarcely doubt it. And till ſuch an eſtabliſhment is effected, America exhibits a phænomenon unknown in the chriſtian world; the religion by law eſtabliſhed in the mother country exiſts, or rather languiſhes there in an imperfect, a mutilated ſtate; and, ſtrange to ſay! theſe aſſerters of liberty and the rights of conſcience, deny their proteſtant brethren, the epiſcopalians, that eſſential part of their conſtitution, which even the intolerant papiſts are allowed, and now enjoy in the King's dominions in Canada. Very eaſy it is to pervert the beſt intentions, to raiſe an alarm, and a flame in minds who are already heated, by ſuggeſting, (however unjuſtly) that the real deſign is to epiſcopize the preſbyterians.—But to this ſuch full anſwers have been given, that 'tis needleſs to repeat them. All that the church of England deſires in America, is the ſame toleration that ſhe grants

grants in Europe;—all ſhe wiſhes, is to have her ſons viſited, confirmed, and ordained;—all civil juriſdiction there ſhe diſclaims;—and with ſuch limited powers, can a Biſhop or Biſhops be ſo formidable as ſome pretend, or work ſuch converſions as others ſeem to fear, without the gift of working miracles, and immediate inſpiration? But this their friends cannot hope, their enemies will not fear.

As to the inſinuation at the cloſe of theſe remarks on the "*uncarved monument* raiſed by his "Grace's charities," this in truth is the greateſt honour, and as ſuch renders ſuperfluous all eulogiums, and, it may be hoped, will diſarm more than the ſtrongeſt arguments the envenomed rage of prejudice and party.

CRITO.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Sept.* 1, 1768.

IT is moſt devoutly to be wiſhed for, by every friend to our country, that the ſcheme of epiſcopizing our colonies may be buried in the ſame grave with the late metropolitan, who was the grand promoter of it. His Grace might enter ſo thoroughly into the ſcheme, to approve himſelf a true ſon of the church in which he was not born or bred, and to waſh out the ſuppoſed ſtains of his preſbyterian education. For, although it is a circumſtance, that ſeems ſtudiouſly concealed in the late public accounts of him, he was certainly born and

and educated, and lived in the communion of the diſſenters, and practiſed ſurgery and phyſic, till he was betwixt twenty and thirty years of age, and did not leave the communion in which he was bred up, or his profeſſion, but upon the offer of very great preferment from the Talbot family.

Indeed in the account of himſelf, communicated to the writer of the *Biographia Britannica*, under the article of Bp. Butler, a diſſenter likewiſe, it is ſaid, that whilſt he was amongſt the diſſenters, he never received the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper with them. This, his Grace, no doubt imagined, would prove, that he was not heartily with the diſſenters, whilſt he was outwardly one of them; of which every one will judge as he thinks beſt.

But Dr. Secker, ſoon after he came to the ſee of Oxford, in his ſermon before the ſociety for propagating the goſpel, &c. begun thoſe invectives againſt our coloniſts, and their religious character, which have been unwarily continued, founded entirely upon miſinformations, and miſrepreſentations of intereſted perſons, the miſſionaries eſpecially, who found their account in abuſing better chriſtians than themſelves.

The preſent governors of our church have no need to give proof of their attachment to it, by invading the liberties or ſeeking to leſſen the numbers of the profeſſors of other proteſtant churches at home or in our colonies. Some of them, to my knowledge, have ſuch generous notions of chriſtian liberty, that they would not think an honeſt diſſenter would be at all the better man for coming over to the church.

I have no doubt therefore, but that the character of our northern coloniſts, of New England eſpecially, will be better inquired into, and juſtice done them, as a truly religious and virtuous people; who now generouſly ſupport near ſix hundred, and a daily increaſing number of chriſtian miniſters of their own, by whoſe labours their people are acknowledged to be the beſt informed, and moſt religious and moral people now exiſting, and therefore can have no need of miſſionaries to be ſent amongſt them, unleſs it be to propagate epiſcopacy, as neceſſary to ſalvation, a doctrine which ſome few zealots ſeek to bring into vogue again in our days, but which is not likely to make its fortune.

Perſuaded as I am of the juſt and honourable intentions of many of the venerable ſociety for propagating the goſpel in foreign parts, I cannot but believe, that, in proportion as they are better informed, they will diſcontinue the ſupport of miſſions to the richeſt and moſt populous parts of New England, where, at a vaſt expence annually, they have been able to raiſe only thirty-three churches, to the neglect of the ſouthern colonies, and Weſt India iſlands, where they are much wanted, and eſpecially to the neglect of the poor native Indians, who ſurely have a claim to their firſt attention, being the very end and deſign of their incorporation.

It muſt be owned, from the pompous accounts ſent over by the miſſionaries of New England, as publiſhed in the ſociety's abſtracts, of the numbers added to their churches, a ſtranger would conclude that they were converts from heatheniſm, or

in-

infidelity at leaſt. Whereas the plain truth is, they have only prevailed with one or two more perſons, to leave the preſbyterian and congregational churches, and go over to the epiſcopal church, and this done not always from the beſt motives; but be the motives of the converts ever ſo good, ſurely the public money might be better employed than in ſupporting ſuch propagators of the epiſcopal mode of worſhip.

I am,

SIR,

Your humble ſervant,

THOMAS CRANMER.

Sept. 1, 1768.

A CARD.

A *Man of Old England* informs *Crito*, that his remarks are well authenticated, notwithſtanding the note in the *Biographia Britannica*; his own wife having been boarded for ſome time within a few doors of Dr. Secker's father's houſe in Cheſterfield, where maſter Thomas often ſpent a playful hour; himſelf was ſchool-fellow with George Secker, his younger brother:—And he is well informed of the Doctor's *ſcepticiſm* at the time of his reſidence in London, from a confident of the late Doctor's, then intimate with him. If *Crito* wants to know more of that matter, there are thoſe who can further inform him, if they ſhould

ſhould think proper. In one word, there is no known miſrepreſentation made of the late *Archbiſhop* in the remarks, upon which *Crito*, if he knew how, would faſten ſome cenſure.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Sept.* 6, 1768.

I Obſerved in the public prints, not long ago, an article from Liverpool, importing that a miniſter among the diſſenters, had lately "renounced "the errors of the church of Scotland," with a reſolution, I ſuppoſe, of conforming to the church of England. What errors theſe might be, is not ſpecified; as I think they ſhould have been to juſtify the Renouncer both to the people whom he left, and to thoſe whom he preferred.

For my part, I cannot ſee upon what authority a private miniſter can pretend thus to throw a public imputation of this ſort upon the church of Scotland in particular. By the act confirming the union of the two kingdoms, both their churches are ſuppoſed to be equally infallible; for the conſtitution of each is in that act, declared to be *unalterable*, in ſo far, that if we believe a certain commentator on that law, to attempt an alteration in either of them, would be to attempt a diſſolution of the union.

And the ſame hath likewiſe been the conſtant language of ſuch of the clergy of the church of England, as have, like faithful watchmen, oppoſed the

the pretenſions of thoſe *viſionaries* who at different periods have ſuggeſted the neceſſity for a farther reformation in that church; a ſort of argument, which ſo far as it goes, is equally forcible on the ſide of the church of Scotland, and implies an equal freedom from error in both churches; and I make no queſtion, but, if a miniſter of the church of England, diſliking the terms of conformity to it, ſhould go over to a diſſenting ſociety, with a public declaration that he renounced the errors of the church of England, he would certainly be told by ſome of our epiſcopalian champions, that he affronted the laws of his country, and deſerved to be cenſured for calling that ſyſtem erroneous, which the wiſdom of the legiſlature had pronounced *unalterable*; nor do I think it would at all alter the caſe, though ſuch declaration ſhould be made in the Tron church in Edinburgh, previous to the admiſſion of the Renegado, as a teacher in that congregation.

How the renunciation above-mentioned would have been received, had it been made before one of our R. R. Dioceſans, I cannot pretend to ſay. Probably the Renouncer would have met with ſome check for making ſo free with the Creed and Directory of the ſiſter kingdom. For however a Biſhop may diſapprove the errors of the church of Scotland in his paſtoral capacity, I apprehend he ought not, as a member of the legiſlature, to ſuffer ſuch a reflection upon any inſtitution which has the ſanction of parliament, to paſs unreproved.

But as little as the champions of the church of England would like a ſtep of this kind in one of their own fraternity, ſeveral of them, in my hearing,

ing, have greatly applauded the ſpirit and conduct of this new conformiſt, alledging that "he muſt be "an honeſt man, who is not aſhamed to ſpeak the "truth. It is plain he thinks the church of Scot-"land erroneous, and he is in the right to ſay ſo." Why then, good gentlemen, ſaid I, were you ſo angry with the learned and worthy Mr. Robertſon, who was not quite ſo peremptory in his exceptions to conformity in the church of England, and whoſe ſincerity was ſurely as well eſtabliſhed as that of your Lancaſhire Proſelyte. And is it poſſible you ſhould have no feelings of your own partiality and inconſiſtency in giving your judgments on theſe two caſes?

Soon after this converſation, I began to conſider this ſuppoſed tranſaction at Liverpool in another light, namely as it might affect the common intereſts of the proteſtant religion; and ſuch as theſe were my reflexions upon it.

Intelligence of this nature ſhould never appear in popular publications, which go of courſe into ſo many hands, without good authority, and proper explanations. I hope the fact is miſreported, and that no ſuch renunciation was made, as I never heard that any ſuch was required of any perſon who thought proper to go over from any proteſtant diſſenting ſociety, to the church of England.

If any ſuch was made, it was moſt probably in the congregation where the Renouncer was thereafter to officiate as a conforming paſtor. It could concern none ſo much as the members of that congregation to have it made. But here the Convert could not be received as a paſtor, without being re-ordained by a Biſhop, and thereby owning the in-

invalidity of preſbyterian ordination: and what can a public act of that kind, joined to the terms of the renunciation, amount to leſs than a declaration, that the eſtabliſhed church of Scotland hath no paſtors properly authoriſed and qualified for the miniſterial office, and conſequently, that the miniſtrations of ſuch perſons as ſhe entertains under the name of paſtors, are void and of no effect?

Bellarmine, indeed, makes it a note of the true church, that her paſtors have a lawful vocation, which according to him, no paſtor can have but from the church of Rome. The conſequence is, that no proteſtant churches are true churches becauſe they have not lawful paſtors.

Now does not the renunciation of this proſelyte, taken along with the circumſtance of re-ordination, treat the church of Scotland, juſt as Bellarmine treats all proteſtant churches whatever? And is not the renouncing this ſuppoſed error of the church of Scotland, concerning the validity of *her* ordinations, and acceding to a church which allows the validity of popiſh ordinations, going more than half way to meet Bellarmine?

We have heard of popiſh prieſts renouncing the errors of the church of Rome, but that ſuch prieſts were re-ordained in order to qualify them for a benefice in the eſtabliſhed church of England, we have never heard. Muſt not the members of the church of England conclude from hence, that there are no errors in the popiſh forms of ordination? For whatever errors the convert from popery renounces, his reception into the church of England without re-ordination, fairly acquits the church of Rome of all ſuſpicion of error in that behalf.

behalf. And no one can well expect, that a proſelyte whoſe acceptation ſuppoſes him to be well ordained, would go about to renounce officiouſly, what the church, for whoſe favours he is an aſpirant, does not require him to renounce.

Is it for the credit of the church of England to treat the idolatrous church of Rome with more tenderneſs than ſhe does the proteſtant churches, which ſeparated from Rome upon the ſame fundamental principles that ſhe herſelf did? Is ſuch mean partiality for the honour of the proteſtant or of the chriſtian religion? Is it for the honour of any man of learning, and good ſenſe, to humour *any* church in ſuch narrow partiality? And is this partiality whereby the church of Scotland is renounced, as no true chriſtian church, conſiſtent with the Act of Union and other acts relating to the church of Scotland, which not only ſuppoſe her to be, but recognize her for a ſiſter church, entitled to her privileges upon the ſame footing with the church of England? And therefore when the anti-reformers plead the Act of Union againſt alterations in the church of England, at the ſame time that they encourage and rejoice in theſe renunciations, can it be ſuppoſed that their pretended regard for the Act of Union is more than a copy of their countenance?

For my part, I cannot but wiſh that this *renouncing* Proſelyte, if ſuch a one there is, had ſpecified the errors he renounced. I cannot conceive what other errors of the church of Scotland, he intended to renounce, but this reſpecting her ordinations, unleſs perhaps the error of worſhiping God without a ſet form. The terms of the

reſpective confeſſions of the two churches of England and Scotland are much the ſame in the articles of the Trinity, Original Sin, Juſtification, Predeſtination and Grace. Both of them profeſs the ſame abhorrence of popiſh idolatry and ſuperſtition. Both of them give an excluſive preference to ſcripture authority in matters of faith and doctrine; nor does either of them think this inconſiſtent with the belief of the three primitive creeds ſo called, And after all this, is it agreeable to the ſpirit and principles of the proteſtant religion, to unchurch the kingdom of Scotland, merely becauſe their miniſters have not epiſcopal ordination? And need we any other circumſtance than the encouragement given to theſe UNCHURCHING RENUNCIATIONS, to account for the averſion the American coloniſts have to receive a Biſhop among them?

I heartily wiſh, Mr. Printer, this remonſtrance may in any degree anſwer the end for which it is intended; which is to perſuade proteſtants of all denominations to unite in the firmeſt bands of chriſtian charity, and to avoid all occaſions of enmity and offence on either ſide. It is but too viſible to thoſe who keep an attentive eye upon popery, that her ſheet anchor at this time, is to divide the church of England from the proteſtant diſſenters, and to foment their ancient animoſities, that they may enter in at the breach. In this they have been too happily ſucceſsful in many inſtances, as may appear from this invidious renunciation; (if ſuch there was) the plain effect of thoſe principles, which under the name of the church of England, have mounted church authority almoſt to

the

the height of the triple crown. Such principles have of late years been much in vogue. We may hope, they will now grow out of faſhion, and that even church of England men may be brought calmly and patiently to conſider, whether our proteſtant diſſenters are treated upon the footing they deſerve, as uſeful and warmly affected ſubjects to our gracious King and his government. We have now a new parliament. May they be induced by a ſerious conſideration of the caſe, to ſeek for proper expedients to ſtrengthen the proteſtant intereſt, by removing the partition wall which has ſo long unhappily ſeparated them into diſtinct parties, expoſed them on each ſide of it to the artifices of the common enemy, and prevented them from exerting their united endeavours againſt thoſe inſidious implements who under the maſk of piety towards God, and implicit obedience to government, have been contriving to lay the axe at the root of our religious and civil liberties.

I am, &c.

VIGILIUS.

ST. JAMES'S CHRONICLE, *Sept.* 8, 1768.

To the PRINTER.

SIR,

THE migration of one grandee from the political world, and of another (probably for a

longer period) from the eccleſiaſtical, has, I find from coffee-houſe chat, cauſed a variety of curious ſpeculations. Theſe events are conſidered as portending alterations in church and ſtate. Miſtake me not, Mr. Baldwin, I do not mean a change of meaſures in the miniſterial department, or a reformation in the church. No one talks, or even thinks of that. I mean merely a change of men. The laſt miniſterial exploits we read of, are ſufficient to aſſure us, that the ſtateſman hath left very reſponſible bail behind him, reſponſible I mean to himſelf, that his ſchemes will be purſued with vigour and uniformity. And though the vacancy occaſioned by the demiſe of the great churchman is now filled by an amiable Prelate, to the great joy and ſatisfaction of every friend to religious liberty, yet it is much queſtioned whether his liberal ſpirit will be allowed to have its perfect work. All that is expected from him I find is, that the promotion of narrow-minded, enſlaving, paſſionate high churchmen, who have been ſo lately upon the ſpur to reach the goal of preferment, as the reward of their labours, will *now* be poſtponed to the advancement of men of more chriſtian principles and diſpoſitions.

How the other vacancy is to be ſupplied, the politicians without doors are not yet agreed; whether by a board of agents, or by a ſingle character under the ſtile of a factor. But however this may be ſettled, ſome diſappointments it is likely will be occaſioned among the political expectants. New men have always friends and favourites, Abigails and country couſins, of their own, whom predilections and proſpects of ſervice will diſpoſe them

to

to prefer before thoſe who are much calier on that liſt, which undoubtedly is left in the hands of the *locum-tenens* for his government in that behalf. And if even a day of account ſhould come, by the return of the principal in peace, (which heaven avert!) the truſtee is probably poſſeſſed of too many, and too important ſecrets, to be intimidated by menaces of retaliation.

What I am ſaying is not mere theory. I have ſeen accounts from our univerſities, and other places of expectation, that certain clerical viſages are conſiderably lengthened within this laſt fortnight; and among my own miniſterial friends in town I have very plainly diſcerned ſeveral pairs of cheek-bones, which a month ago you might have looked for with as little ſucceſs as for Mr. Wildman's Queen-Bee.

But to be ſerious. Providence hath frequently brought about events of this kind, with circumſtances which point out the uſe we ought to make of them; and our prudent forefathers have occaſionally profited by them, both for themſelves and their poſterity. The influence of men of miſchief hath often been cut ſhort, and a day of reckoning ſuddenly and unexpectedly brought upon their tools and implements. Suffice it for me to obſerve, without going back to hiſtory for examples, that we have now a breathing-time from our late apprehenſions, whither the power and policy of two enterpriſing leaders might conduct us. Let us endeavour now to profit by the profeſſions of our real patriots, (if any ſuch there are) near the helm. Let us not ceaſe to animate them to employ this important interval in opening better pro-

ſpects. There is little doubt but opportunities will be afforded them in no long time. The moſt ſagacious ſtateſman cannot foreſee what may happen in the turn of a ſingle month; and though the *abſentee* may have left ample inſtructions, by way of providing for hypothetical exigencies, yet ſecond-ſight is a jeſt among Engliſhmen; and divers embarraſſments from unſuſpected quarters may come upon the confidential groupe, which may afford very ſubſtantial advantages to the friends of the revolution ſettlement, long before the patching expedients can poſſibly arrive from Bareges.

Be vigilant, be active, O ye upon whom your faithful fellow-ſubjects depend for the future quiet of a gracious King, and the freedom and welfare of a generous people. Have an eye upon every department of government. Be attentive to what is doing in the law, in the military, in the church. You need not be reminded of the fatal conſequences of over-grown power, grafted upon deſpotic principles, in any of theſe provinces. Some of you are already entruſted by the people with the patronage of their deareſt rights and privileges; ſome of you ſo entruſted, we hope, are zealouſly diſpoſed to afford them all the redreſs and protection in your power. Be it your ſtudy to make way for ſtill more of the ſame principles and reſolutions. There are two points of true politics which you ſhould ever have in your minds: 1. That where the domeſtic policy of any people is not fixed upon a conſtitutional baſis, it is in vain to look for ſucceſs in foreign negotiations; and, 2. That there is no rectifying the diſorders of domeſtic policy, without bringing delinquents to con-

dign puniſhment, and ſetting them up as public examples to deter all thoſe who may be inclined to tread in their ſteps, from diverting the courſe of public juſtice to gratify private reſentment; from violating their honour, pledged to the people, in return for their confidence; from miſrepreſenting the beſt-affectioned ſubjects of his Majeſty's government, as men of evil deſigns and factious principles; and, in one word, from forging chains for their fellow-ſubjects, whether in church or ſtate. If ever you have it in your power, let not a man of theſe be ſpared, as you tender the future welfare, peace, and conſequence of your country, the ſecurity of your own freedom and property, and the eaſe and honour, the virtue and reputation of your poſterity.

Be more eſpecially at this period diligent in enquiring after, and induſtrious in detecting the man, who, under the inſolent and malicious leader of the band, has been the chief inſtrument in ſowing the ſeeds of diſſenſion between the mother-country and her colonies: The induſtrious artificer, who drew up the progreſſive plan of inſults, contrived to drive theſe worthy and affectionate ſubjects into ſuch oppoſition as might afford a pretence for infringing their civil liberties. The parent of the plot againſt their religious freedom, pregnant with all the evils which drove their anceſtors into the tranſatlantic wilderneſs, is now detected *ſuo indicio*. At length we know him, by the terms of a late legacy, ſo inconſiderable indeed for the purpoſe to which it is appropriated, that one cannot help thinking the bequeſt was made as a cover for his deſpair that the pernicious project would ever be

accompliſhed, and at the ſame time as a memorial to his brethren of his good-will to the coloniſts, and to the bleſſed diſcipline of ſome of his predeceſſors nearer home.

But he is gone, and it is not for the ſake of loading a dead man with unavailing reflections that theſe obſervations are made. It is to excite your caution and vigilance with reſpect to thoſe of the ſame temper, whom he may have left behind him in ſtations which are not without ſome degree of the ſame influence, and to whom he may have bequeathed his zeal, and conſequently the execution of his projects, whenever occaſion ſhall offer. Be theſe warnings vain and chimerical, void of every ſpice of wiſdom and good ſenſe, if any period can be pointed out in the Britiſh hiſtory, when the rights of the people were ever invaded by the civil powers with any ſucceſs, without the aid and concurrence of the church.

I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

NIL ADMIRARI.

LONDON CHRONICLE, *Sept.* 10, 1768.

To the PRINTER.

SIR,

EXALTED characters, like that of the late Archbiſhop of Canterbury, ſhould be handled in public news-papers with great tenderneſs. His Grace

Grace was in many reſpects a very great man. But had I been in the place of your correſpondent Crito, I ſhould not have attempted to ſupport his honour upon the credit of Biſhop Butler's article in the Biographia Britannica; the compiler of which is well known by his ſignature; ſo well known, that it is incredible his Grace ſhould communicate to ſuch an one any particulars relating, either to his own or Biſhop Butler's hiſtory. It is, I think, next to demonſtrable, from the following circumſtances, that he did not. The Biographer, as cited by Crito, "takes upon him to aſſure the "reader that Dr. Secker never received the commu-"nion in any other than the church of England." In the body of the remark [D] we are told, that "Dr. Secker, after he left the academy in "Glouceſterſhire, applied himſelf to the ſtudy of "phyſick, which he purſued five years at London, "Paris, and Leyden, and at the laſt place took "the degree of M. D. in March, 1720-1. But "*changing his purpoſe*, he entered himſelf of Exeter "College, Oxford, April, 1721, took epiſcopal "orders, and was made domeſtic chaplain to "Biſhop Talbot, 1722." Now if his Grace the late Archbiſhop was 74 when he died, he muſt have been born in 1694, and conſequently was 27 years of age, or thereabouts, when he took the degree of M. D. This was before *he changed his purpoſe*, and while he was, *by profeſſion*, a diſſenter; and conſequently, Dr. Secker, according to theſe particulars, was *twenty-ſeven* years of age before he received the communion in any chriſtian congregation. Can any man of common ſenſe believe ſo improbable a fact, and particularly, that

the Biographer ſhould have it from the Archbiſhop himſelf? Crito muſt therefore either meet *The Man of Old England* with better weapons, or acknowledge, what, I dare ſay, he would be very unwilling the world ſhould believe.

Again, Had the Biographer been favoured, as he pretends, with intelligence from the late Archbiſhop, would he, or could he have omitted all mention of Biſhop Butler's remarkable charge to his clergy in 1752? Would the Archbiſhop have ſuffered the biographer to be ignorant of ſo illuſtrious a teſtimony, that his moſt intimate friend Dr. Butler really, and *bona fide*, had renounced the principles of the proteſtant diſſenters? And muſt not Crito have been ſtrangely miſled, to believe that his Grace ſhould either relate a circumſtance to Mr. P. which carried with it ſuch a reflection on his own religion in his younger years; or omit to relate a circumſtance in Biſhop Butler's hiſtory, which would do him honour among all the true ſons of the church of England, to the lateſt poſterity?

As for his Grace's zeal for epiſcopiſing the American colonies, I heartily wiſh there were no better evidence of it, than the credit and veracity of ſuch a biographer. But the fact, I fear, is too well aſcertained to be diſputed. It has been confeſſed by many who greatly honoured and reſpected the Archbiſhop, that this was a weak, if not a culpable part of his conduct, eſpecially as his Grace could hardly be ignorant, that the paſſion and vehemence with which this project was eſpouſed by ſome of the church of England Miſſionaries, was one great ingredient in the jealouſy entertained by the coloniſts for ſome time of the deſigns of the mother country.

It is in vain for Crito to declaim as he does, on the reſtraint of toleration, while the admiſſion of Biſhops is oppoſed by the coloniſts. It is vain for him to parade on the moderation of the epiſcopal plan intended for the colonies, when ſo many ſermons are in print, preached before a certain ſociety, wherein the antiepiſcopalian coloniſts are pictured worſe than heathen men and publicans were by the Jews. The Archbiſhop's weight and authority, without doubt, drew many into his ſentiments, who without it would have diſcerned the inconvenience of his ſcheme at leaſt at the preſent criſis. Upon his Grace's demiſe, it has been hoped, we ſhould hear no more of it. It has been hoped, by men of the firſt conſequence for true diſintereſted patriotiſm, and for their unbiaſſed attachment to the honour of our gracious Sovereign, and the welfare of the mother country. In this light I cannot but conſider the paper of the *Man of Old England*, as a ſeaſonable and laudable endeavour to ſhew the public the pernicious tendency of the epiſcopizing project. And ſorry I am, heartily ſorry, that at a time when councils of peace and reconciliation between the mother country and her American children are become ſo neceſſary, and the ſucceſs of them ſo deſireable by Britons of all ranks, there ſhould ſtill be left among us even one man ſo bigotted and ſo wrong-headed, as, under the pretence of vindicating a reſpectable Prelate, and a regard for the church of England, ſhould patronize a meaſure which never did any honour to the one, nor, if carried into execution, would ever do any credit, or be of any real benefit to the other, at the ſame time that it adminiſters freſh fuel to a flame too ready to break out

and too alarming not to give every well-wiſher to his country, very ſerious thoughts of heart for the conſequences. I am, &c.

PHORMIO.

P. S. I can aſſure Crito, that the Americans of the proteſtant non-epiſcopal congregations, had no hand in ſending the popiſh Biſhop to Canada. He was ſent by thoſe who were never their friends, and who, if fame is to be credited when authenticated by good collateral teſtimony, had the countenance and encouragement of ſome great churchmen, who have ſince drawn an argument from that event, for ſending a brother of their own with the like power and privileges, without the like ſecurity given for his good behaviour, among the proteſtants of New England.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Sept.* 17, 1768.

IN the letter of the Houſe of Repreſentatives of the province of the Maſſachuſett's Bay, to their agent Dennis de Berdt, Eſq; Jan. 12, 1768, amongſt their other grievances, which they complain of, and which every true Engliſhman muſt wiſh to have redreſſed, we find the following paragraph.

" The eſtabliſhment of a proteſtant epiſcopate " in America is alſo very zealouſly contended for: " and

" and it is very alarming to a people, whoſe fa-
" thers, from the hardſhips they ſuffered under
" ſuch an eſtabliſhment, were obliged to fly their
" native country into a wilderneſs, in order peace-
" ably to enjoy their privileges, civil and reli-
" gious; their being threatened with the loſs of
" both at once, muſt throw them into a very diſ-
" agreeable ſituation. We hope in God ſuch an
" eſtabliſhment will never take place in America,
" and we deſire you will ſtrenuouſly oppoſe it."

Thus it fully appears, what was long ago prognoſticated in your paper, that their juſt jealouſies of a prelatical power, have been long one of thoſe ſcourges the Americans have dreaded, and with which they were menaced by a late great eccleſiaſtic, who was himſelf born and bred amongſt preſbyterians, but who happily was not able to carry his project into execution. May all ambitious projects that bear hard upon the natural unalienable rights of conſcience, ever periſh with their projectors, as I believe will be the fate of this. For it is with great pleaſure that I read a few days ago, an article in the public papers, which I ſhall make no ſcruple to tranſcribe, as I hope it comes from good authority.

" We hear it is abſolutely determined not to
" eſtabliſh epiſcopacy in America, for two reaſons:
" firſt, becauſe it is not thought neceſſary, and
" ſecondly, becauſe the Americans are not likely
" to ſubmit to it."

I truſt this is an omen of all differences being amicably adjuſted betwixt the colonies and the mother country.

But

But an advocate for the epiſcopizing ſcheme in your paper has lately tried his beſt to provoke the nation againſt the Americans, by pretending, that the latter are ſo implacably ſet againſt the church of England and its profeſſors amongſt them, that they will not let them be on the ſame footing with all other ſects and diſſenters, by obſtinately oppoſing their having Biſhops ſettled amongſt them.

But let this man know, what has often been declared and proved, that the Americans would be far from making any ſort of oppoſition to the few epiſcopalians in the colonies chuſing for themſelves a Biſhop, and giving him a preſiding power over themſelves, and maintaining him at their own expence. What they remonſtrate againſt, and commiſſion their agent Mr. de Berdt ſtrenuouſly to oppoſe, is the eſtabliſhment of a Lord Biſhop among them, with high powers and authority from Old England, in which he is to be ſupported with great pomp, and by contributions levied againſt their conſent from preſbyterians and congregationaliſts, who hold ſuch an eccleſiaſtical power to be unlawful and unſcriptural.

I aſk the contenders for the eſtabliſhment of ſuch a prelatical power being forced upon the colonies, how they would have taken it, if the late expelled tyrant James II. had reſtored his Roman clergy to the power and dignities they enjoyed before the reformation, which he meditated to have done, and had obliged the clergy and people of the church of England to contribute to their lordly maintenence and ſupport, whether they would not have loudly exclaimed againſt ſuch a meaſure as moſt arbitrary and injurious?

Or,

Or, how would our brethren, fellow-ſubjects, and fellow-chriſtians in North Britain, reliſh the introduction of an epiſcopal power amongſt them, and to be conſtrained to pay to the ſupport of what they hold in the higheſt averſion?

I ſhould be glad to know what difference there is in the reſpective caſes. I never heard it aſſerted upon any ſufficient grounds, nor could I ever bring myſelf to believe, that our excellent Sovereign and Legiſlature ever intended to lay ſuch a burden on our American brethren. I have ever looked upon it as merely the device of a very few bigot-headed or ambitious churchmen: For I am perſuaded that very many of our own church are againſt it in Old England, and not a few of its few profeſſors in New England are far from deſiring an epiſcopal power, and its neceſſary attendants ſtalking forth amongſt them. Our common Lord expreſsly declared his kingdom was not of this world, but too many of his diſciples in all ages ſeem to have dreamt of no other.

I am,

SIR,

Your moſt humble ſervant,

ATLANTICUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Sept.* 20, 1768.

WHO the late Archbiſhop was, and whether born at Nottingham or Cheſterfield, is of very little conſequence to the public; but to conſider *what* he was and *what* he did in his exalted ſtation, may have its uſe.

Crito, in your Chronicle of the 25th ult. thinks it a diſgrace to him, that he ſhould be ſuppoſed to have any connection with the diſſenters in his younger time, or ever to have been ſo ſilly as to have had thoughts of caſting in his lot with them. —They had certainly no rich Prebendſhips to offer, or Archbiſhoprics to place in proſpect;—what weight theſe might have with him in the *choice* of his profeſſion, he beſt knew.—The *event* has proved that in *that choice* he ſhewed the *wiſdom* of the ſerpent, and if the *innocence* of the dove was mixed with it, he fulfilled the direction of his maſter.

As to the imputation thrown out by the *Old England Man* in your paper, of his advancing gradually in the faith of the civil church eſtabliſhment till he reached Canterbury:—That will be beſt removed, by Crito's pointing out ſuch inſtances of his public conduct, as might effectually free him therefrom.

That a narrow impoſing uncharitable ſpirit was far from him;—that he conſtantly uſed his power and in-

influence for reforming every thing that was amiſs; —that though he was at the head of eccleſiaſtical power, yet his heart abhorred any improper uſe of it; but, on the contrary, took all opportunities to encourage religion and liberty *as ſuch*, to diſcountenance popery, unite proteſtants, and be continually contriving ſomewhat or other for the eaſe of tender conſciences, both within and without the eſtabliſhment.—I ſay, a brief narration of facts flowing from theſe principles would moſt effectually ſilence all illiberal and unjuſt ſurmiſes.

Did not he give one thouſand pounds towards the eſtabliſhment of an American Biſhop; and could there be a greater proof of his zeal for religion? For you cannot but know, ſince *Archbiſhop Laud's time*, epiſcopal ordination has been deemed ſo neceſſary by *ſome* of his ſucceſſors, that there can be no chriſtian church without it: how *important* muſt it then be!—and ſurely you would not have Biſhops follow the example of ſuch a fellow as Whitefield, to run up and down the country preaching the goſpel as he calls it;—no, a fixed reſidence at ſome capital town, with a ſalary more than equal to fifty of the more laborious paſtors in America, would ſet him as a light ſhining in a dark place, and carry conviction at the very appearance.

"Is it not a ſhame (Crito goes on to obſerve) "that people ſhould be obliged to croſs the At- "lantic, for the hand of a Biſhop on their head— "is not there a popiſh Biſhop in Canada? And "ſhould not there be a proteſtant one in like man- "ner at Boſton or New York?—What is it theſe "American proteſtants are afraid of?—Do they

"think

" think the deſign is to epiſcopize the preſby-
" terians? "

To this a full anſwer has been given [where and by whom is not ſaid] ſure I am, Dr. Douglaſs in his ſummary of the Britiſh ſettlements in America, has theſe words: " Any indifferent man " could not avoid imagining, that by propagating " the goſpel in foreign parts was meant the con- " verſion of the natives of ſuch parts, as the royal " charter enjoins the civilizing and converſion of " the Indians by doctrine and example.—It is aſto- " niſhing to hear ſome of theſe miſſionaries, and " their friends, *indiſcreetly* affirm, that this was " no part of the deſign, becauſe not expreſſed in " ſtrong terms in their charter.—Surely King " William the granter could not be imagined to " have meant that the expelling or elbowing out " our ſober orthodox diſſenters was the principal " intention thereof, though at preſent their *chief* " *practice*; there is not one miſſionary, the Albany " and Mohawk excepted, that takes the leaſt notice " of the Indians; till the ſociety, ſenſible of this " neglect in their lateſt miſſion, inſtructed Mr Price " to endeavour, &c.—The practice of the preſent " miſſionaries is to obtain miſſions to the moſt ci- " vilized and rich towns, where there are no *Indi-* " *ans*, nor *Catholicks*, nor *want* of an *orthodox* " *Chriſtian Miniſtry*—the three chief intentions of " the miſſion.—They ſeem abſurdly to value them- " ſelves on the converſion (I do not ſay the per- " verſion) of the preſbyterians and congrega- " tionaliſts—more than on the converſion of an hea- " then or catholic.—In the latter years of Queen " Anne perhaps the deſign was perverted from the

ori-

" original one of converting the heathens, to that " of conformity, a manuduction to popery, and " introduction of the Pretender.—I have for my " own part a great regard for all good miniſters " of the goſpel, and have no particular reſent- " ment againſt any miſſionary; but, as an impar- " tial hiſtorian, I relate matters of fact."

This author has many other remarks worthy the notice of the reader, for which I muſt refer to the book, or to a large account given of it in the Monthly Review for October, 1755, p. 267.—Let this extract ſuffice for the preſent. And what anſwer can Crito give to it? who is ſo modeſt as to ſay, " All that is deſired, is the ſame toleration that " church grants in Europe."—Be it known then, that ſo far is New England from a perſecuting ſpirit, or refuſing the *ſame* toleration, that all profeſſed members of the church of England are even excuſed from paying any taxes towards the ſettlement of any miniſters or meeting houſes but *their own*—no *teſts* to exclude from civil offices—no *oaths* or *ſubſcriptions* to bar from public academies —Pray are their brethren *ſo tolerated in Old England?*—Will they themſelves in the next century be *ſo tolerated* in *New England*, if any ſucceſſors of Laud with his wealth and power preſide?——But Crito concludes, " All civil juriſdictions he diſ- " claims." Will he permit me to aſk him, who gave him authority to ſay ſo —what ſecurity?

A late writer in ſome public paper is of a different opinion: His words are, Well may the people of the American ſettlements be uneaſy at the thoughts of Biſhops coming over among them with *their alliance*—there the *danger* lies; for it

was

was this, though imaginary alliance, yet real union of church and ſtate power, that drove the firſt ſettlers into theſe remote parts of the globe—like cauſes may produce like effects.—*Their miniſters* may be *diſgraced*, accounted as *ſchiſmatics*, without the *pale of the alliance*, and by the zeal of the ſociety for propagating the goſpel, one would think, without the pale of the chriſtian covenant, with oaths and ſubſcriptions to bar from public academies, teſts to exclude from civil offices, ſpiritual courts, &c. Gibeonites, not Jews, &c. Are not all theſe, and more than theſe, ſtill at home? It has indeed been ſaid in the public papers, that it was not intended by ſending Biſhops to diſtreſs thoſe who were of a different opinion, but only to have the ſons of the church viſited, confirmed, and ordained.—But who has *authority* to anſwer for this? What ſecurity? Why ſhould the Americans expect any other there than they would have if they were in Old England? Who can ſay a Tillotſon may not be ſucceeded by a Laud; and when eccleſiaſtical power is in ſuch hands with the *claims* and in *the uſe of alliance* power, how precarious and low muſt the liberties and privileges of all nonconformiſts be? An epiſcopal religious ſociety, with forms, rules, and orders, affecting only their own members, is one thing; an epiſcopal ſociety, with claims of ſtate and church power affecting the civil and religious intereſts of others, is quite another thing. It is their entrenching by law with their great wealth and power; talking of alliances like family compacts, to diſtreſs others around them; it is this ſuperior air of authority

that

that gives the umbrage and ground of ſear. But I muſt not take up too much room in your paper, and therefore ſhall at preſent only add that

I am,

Your humble ſervant,

A. M.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Sept.* 22, 1768

YOUR correſpondent Crito has favoured the public with an extract from the Biſhop of Lincoln's ſermon, preached before the ſociety for propagating the goſpel. He than proceeds to commend the moderation of the Biſhop's ſentiments, concerning the epiſcopizing of the colonies. I readily agree with him, that this worthy prelate has diſcovered a better temper than many who have been employed upon the ſame occaſion: nevertheleſs, I think it incumbent upon me, to point out a capital defect in the reaſoning he has laid before the public.

His Lordſhip is pleaſed to aſk; "Should not we, "who allow others the free exerciſe of their "religious rights be allowed to exerciſe our own?" I would here aſk what are the rights his Lordſhip means? Have not the members of the church of England in North America the right of aſſembling and worſhipping God Almighty according to the dictates of their own conſciences? And what farther

right

rights can they demand? We are given to understand, that the church of England cannot be complete without epiſcopacy; and conſequently the members of this church ought to be indulged in what they look upon as eſſentially neceſſary to the very being and exiſtence of it, as much as the members of any other community whatſoever. This is the capital of the cauſe. This is the darling argument of epiſcopalians. But in anſwer to this argument, I deny that epiſcopacy has any thing to do with our church, any farther than it is connected with the ſtate. And I call upon Crito to ſhew one paſſage in the liturgy, or articles of the church of England, wherein is aſſerted the divine right of epiſcopacy, or denies the validity of the ordinations of any other of the reformed churches.

It is well known, that Biſhops in the church of England, are no more than preſbyters ſet apart by act of parliament to perform certain offices in the ſaid church. None of our reformers made any diſtinction between a Biſhop and a preſbyter; and all the ſeparate powers enjoyed by our Biſhops are derived from the authority of the ſtate, and do by no means belong to them as clergymen of the church of England.

The Biſhop of London's commiſſary, with the approbation of his temporal ſuperiors, has as much right to confer orders as his Lordſhip himſelf. The uninterrupted ſucceſſion is no part of the doctrine of the church of England, and conſequently, if any of the American clergy are ſo unfortunate as to loſe their lives in their paſſage to England for epiſcopal ordination, they can thank nobody but themſelves, ſeeing that, in ſo doing,

they

they perform an action not enjoined by our church; which, conſidered as unconnected with the ſtate, admits of any ordination, received from the hands of proteſtant miniſters. From hence it appears, that no one can make liberty of conſcience a plea for epiſcopizing the Americans.

As to the other part of his Lordſhip's argument, that the ſending of Biſhops to America would be a reſtraint upon the behaviour of other clergymen; this plainly ſhews that ſuch Biſhops are to be veſted with a temporal power, quite inconſiſtent with the liberties of the coloniſts. But I ſhould be glad to be informed, why his Lordſhip ſhould pay ſo poor a compliment to the governors, and the reſt of the civil magiſtrates of that country, as to ſuppoſe them to be incapable of rectifying any diſorders among the clergy, without calling in the aſſiſtance of the eccleſiaſtics? I ſhall ſay no more upon this ſubject; but beg leave to recommend it to our prelates to regulate church affairs in this country, and to put them upon a more reſpectable footing, before they think of ſending Biſhops acroſs the Atlantic. I am,

SIR,

Your humble ſervant,

Old Jewry. *A Country Clergyman.*

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Sept.* 22, 1768.

CONSIDERING that the Bible is a book that ſcarce a family is without, is it not ſtrange that the fine preface of the tranſlators, which is inſerted with the dedication to King James in the royal folio edition, and in ſeveral other of the folio editions, is, in the ſmaller ones (even the quarto) entirely omitted?—What can be the meaning of it? I ſee no reaſon why the quarto edition in particular, which is the ſize generally bought for the uſe of a family, ſhould not have this ſenſible and well-written introduction to it; and yet in all the Bibles of that ſize, that I ever met with, I never ſaw one that had it.

I wiſh that the Printers of the future editions would diſregard the trifling expence that it would put them to, to prefix it to *every* Bible, large and ſmall, which any perſon then may purchaſe.—I firſt ſaw it in the large Bible that lies in the Guard Room at St. James's; and aſſure you, that I never read a better preface.

Yours, &c.

PHILO-LOGOS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Sept.* 27, 1768.

A. M. (whoever he be, whether *A Man of Old England*, or of *New*) may be aſſured that his cauſe can never be ſerved by miſrepreſenting and miſquoting his opponents.—He is pleaſed to ſay, in his letter in your paper of the 20th, that "Crito thinks it a diſgrace to the late Archbiſhop, "that he ſhould be ſuppoſed to have any con-"nection with the diſſenters in his younger time, "or ever to have been ſo ſilly as to have had any "thoughts of caſting in his lot with them." How A. M. ſhould divine my thoughts, is difficult to conceive: Certain it is, theſe are no words of mine; and thus called upon, I muſt add, that very far were they from my thoughts, having as candid and as good an opinion of all conſcientious diſſenters, as this writer himſelf can have, or any of his brethren. All I endeavoured (in the letter referred to) was merely to eſtabliſh a matter of fact (without making the leaſt reflection) which I thought could not be better done than by appealing to a note, communicated by the Archbiſhop himſelf, to the author of Biſhop Butler's life in the Biographia.* And that he really communicated

* "During the courſe of fifty years, that ſending Biſhops "to America hath been in agitation, I believe, no ſingle "perſon there or here hath once named or thought of New "England as a proper place for the reſidence of one; but "epiſcopal colonies have always been propoſed."

Anſwer to Dr. Mayhew's Obſervations, p. 66.

thoſe particulars cannot be doubted, as it is aſſerted in the margin that he did, and as neither he nor his friends ever contradicted it.

A little farther, A. M. quotes, as he pretends, another paſſage from my letter, and has marked it as a quotation with inverted commas. The expreſſions, however (ridiculous as ſome of them are) are all his own, and ſo are all the ſentiments. For inſtance; where has Crito, or any one elſe ever mentioned Boſton or New York as a proper reſidence for a Biſhop? In truth, no Biſhop, I fancy, would chuſe to ſettle there; as, if he did, he might probably meet with the fate of the Archbiſhop of St. Andrew's. But this is no reaſon why a Biſhop ſhould not be fixed at Quebec, or in ſome of the epiſcopal colonies. Though the number of preſbyterians in New England is an objection, the number of papiſts in Canada would be none.

Leaving this writer to combat ſeveral other phantoms of his own raiſing, I ſhall only produce (as he deſires it) my authority for ſaying that an American Biſhop or Biſhops would diſclaim all civil juriſdiction, which is no leſs than that of the late Archbiſhop himſelf, in a pamphlet (allowed to be his) entitled "An Anſwer to Dr. Mayhew's "Obſervations on the Charter and Conduct of the "Society, &c." His words are theſe: "All mem-"bers of every church, are, according to the prin-"ciples of liberty, entitled to every part of what "they conceive to be the benefits of it, entire and "complete, ſo far as conſiſts with the welfare of "civil government; yet the members of our "church in America, do not enjoy thus its benefits, "having no proteſtant Biſhop within three thou-

"ſand

" ſand miles of them; a caſe which never had its
" parallel before in the chriſtian world. There-
" fore it is deſired, that two or more Biſhops may
" be appointed for them, to reſide where his Ma-
" jeſty ſhall think moſt convenient; that they may
" have no concern in the leaſt with any perſons
" who do not profeſs themſelves to be of the
" church of England, but may ordain miniſters
" for ſuch as do; may confirm their children when
" brought to them at a fit age for that purpoſe,
" and take ſuch overſight of the epiſcopal clergy,
" as the Biſhop of London's Commiſſaries in
" thoſe parts have been empowered to take, and
" have taken, without offence.—But it is not de-
" ſired in the leaſt that they ſhould hold Courts
" to try matrimonial or teſtamentary cauſes, or
" be veſted with any authority now exerciſed
" either by provincial governors or ſubordinate
" magiſtrates, or infringe or diminiſh any privileges
" and liberties enjoyed by any of the laity, even
" of our own communion.—This is the real and
" the only ſcheme that hath been planned for
" Biſhops in America; and whoever hath heard of
" any other hath been miſinformed through miſtake
" or deſign. The American diſſenters from our
" communion would think it inſupportably grie-
" vous to have no miniſters but ſuch as received
" ordination in England or Ireland, or to be
" withheld from the uſe of any religious rite,
" which they eſteemed as highly as we do con-
" firmation; or to have their churches deſtitute
" of a ſuperintendency, which they conceived to be
" of apoſtolical inſtitution. I ſhould, in ſuch a
" caſe be a zealous advocate for them, as not yet

" enjoying the full toleration to which they had a " right. And ſurely they ought to aſk their con- " ſciences very ſeriouſly, why they oppoſe our ap- " plication for ſuch indulgence, as they would " claim for themſelves; and whether indeed ſuch " oppoſition is not downright perſecution, and " that in a matter merely ſpiritual, without the " mixture of any temporal concern." P. 59, 60.

I cannot conclude without obſerving, that ſome late alarming tranſactions, and the republican ſpirit which prevails in ſome of our colonies, give too much reaſon to apprehend that what has happened in England may happen in America; and that this rage againſt epiſcopacy may be a prelude to the downfal of monarchy. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

CRITO.

Sept. 29, 1768.

A letter from the late ARCHBISHOP *of* CANTERBURY *to the* ARCHBISHOP *of* PARIS.

[From the French of VOLTAIRE.]

" I Received, my Lord, your mandate againſt " the great Beliſarius, General of Juſtinian's " army and againſt M. Marmontel of the French " academy, with your coat of arms in two places; " over them is a great hat, and they are accompa-

" nied

" nied by two taſſels of fifteen tufts each; the " whole ſigned ' *Chriſtopher, by my Lord, La Touche,*' " with a flouriſh.

" We, for our part, never iſſue mandates but " to our tenants, and I own, my Lord, that I " could have wiſhed a little more chriſtian humi- " lity in your proceeding. Beſides I do not ſee " why you affect to proclaim in your title, that " you condemn *M. Marmontel of the French Aca-* " *demy.*

" If thoſe who drew up your mandate, found " that a General of Juſtinian's army did not ex- " preſs himſelf like an orthodox divine of your " communion, you ought, I think, to have been " contented with ſaying ſo, without expoſing a " reſpectable body, compoſed of Princes of the " Blood, Cardinals, Prelates, like yourſelf, Dukes " and Peers, Marſhals of France, Magiſtrates, " and the moſt illuſtrious men of letters. The " French Academy has, in my opinion, nothing " to do with your theological diſputes.

" Give me leave to tell you, that, if we iſſue " mandates on ſuch occaſions, we ſhould draw " them up ourſelves. I am ſorry that your man- " datory has condemned this propoſition of the " great Beliſarius; ' *God is terrible to the wicked;* " *I believe it, but I am good.*' I aſſure you, my " Lord, that if our King, who is the head of our " church, ſhould ſay, *I am good*, we ſhould not " draw up a mandate againſt him. *I am good*, " means, I think, in every country, ' I have a " good heart, I love goodneſs, I love juſtice, I " would have my ſubjects happy.' In ſhort, I can- " not ſee why a man ſhould be damned for having

" a good heart. The King of France, as every
" body tells me, is very good, nay, ſo good, as
" to pardon your repeated acts of diſobedience,
" which have diſturbed France, and which all
" Europe has looked upon as a wrong turn of
" mind. You are, no doubt, good enough to re-
" pent of it.

" We cannot ſee that Beliſarius is deſerving of
" hell for ſaying that he was a good man. You
" pretend that this goodneſs is heretical, becauſe
" St. Peter, in his 1ſt Epiſt. ch. v. ver. 5. has
" ſaid, *God reſiſteth the proud.* But he who made
" your mandate ſcarce conſidered what he wrote.
" *God reſiſteth*, I allow; reſiſtance well becomes
" God. But whom does he reſiſt, according to St.
" Peter? Read ingenuouſly what goes before it,
" and you will ſee that he reſiſts prieſts who ſtarve
" their flock, and above all, the younger who do
" not ſubmit themſelves to the elder. *Be cloathed*
" *with humility*, ſays he, *one towards another, for*
" *God reſiſteth the proud.*

" But let me aſk you what connection there is
" between this reſiſtance of God, and the goodneſs
" of Beliſarius? The recommendation of humi-
" lity has its uſe, but common ſenſe ſhould alſo
" be recommended.

" It is ſtrange that your mandatory ſhould cri-
" ticiſe that humane and ſimple expreſſion of Beli-
" ſarius: *Is it neceſſary that ſo many ſhould be re-*
" *probated?* You would not only hinder Beliſarius
" from being good, but you would alſo limit the
" goodneſs of the God of mercy. What pleaſure
" ſhould you have, if you pleaſe, if all the world
" were damned? We are not ſo unmerciful in our
" iſland.

" iſland. Our predeceſſor, the great Tillotſon, " allowed to be the moſt ſenſible and leaſt decla- " matory preacher in Europe, has expreſſed him- " ſelf like Beliſarius in almoſt all his ſermons. Give " me leave here to take his part. Be damned, if " you pleaſe, my Lord, but let me tell you, that " I would not be ſo, and likewiſe that I wiſh my " friends may not; we ought to have a little cha- " rity. I could ſay much more to your manda- " tory; above all, I would recommend it to him " to be leſs prolix; prolixity is always fatal to " mandates, it is an eſſential point to which too " little attention is paid in your country.

" On the whole, my dear brother, I recommend " you to the divine goodneſs, though the word " *good* has given you ſo much uneaſineſs."

Your good brother,

The ARCHBISHOP *of* CANTERBURY.

" P. S. When you write to the Biſhop of Rome, " pray make my compliments to him; I have ſtill " much regard for him conſidered as a brother. I " am told that he has lately met with ſome diſa- " greeable circumſtances; that a Neapolitan horſe " has given his mule a dreadful kick, that a Vene- " tian Gondalo has run foul of St. Peter's Bark, " and that a Parmeſan cheeſe has occaſioned him a " violent fit of indigeſtion. I am ſorry for it, he " is ſaid to be a good man, forgive me that expreſ- " ſion. I was well acquainted with his father in " my travels through Italy, he was a good Banker, " but the ſon ſeems to me not to have underſtood " his own account."

For the LONDON CHRONICLE.

Oct. 11, 1768.

The ARCHBISHOP *of* PARIS's *Anſwer to a late* ARCHBISHOP *of* CANTERBURY's *Letter.*

My very good Lord,

YOUR Grace and your brethren, it ſeems, "iſſue no mandates except to your tenants." Be it ſo. But whether this is for want of *Will* or of *Power*, your Grace doth not mention, nor do I pretend to determine.

However, if our intelligencers on your ſide the channel do not impoſe upon us, Marmontel's Beliſarius ſhould be no more a favourite with your Grace than it is with me; as our advices from thence are uniform concerning your Grace's utter diſlike of writings of the ſame tendency. And if the academy of politics in Great Britain admit not of your Grace's fulminatory mandates, your Grace does well and wiſely not to expoſe your hierarchical authority to contempt and deriſion, by pronouncing upon thoſe writings inefficient ſentences of condemnation.

As for us, My Lord, we know very well what we are doing. Mandates have been current among us for many ages; and though Voltaire and a few ſneerers of the academy may grin at them, nay though the civil power may occaſionally interpoſe be-

between them and the devoted heretic, we know they mortify certain perſons to the quick, and have their weight and their ſting where we deſign they ſhould have it, and that is enough for us. For the reſt, I, for my part, have as little deſire that my mandates ſhould break any bones, as your Grace may have to ſend culprits of Mr. Marmontel's complexion to the pillory, or, if churchmen, to ſeek their bread in deſolate places.

On the other hand, though your Grace may iſſue no mandates in public form, there are certainly ways and means in the hands of perſons of your Grace's conſequence, of doing the ſame ſort of buſineſs with full effect by other inſtruments, where the flaſh and the report give no alarm. If I may aſk it without offence to politeneſs—may there not be familiars about your Grace, or at leaſt within your influence, ready to receive and execute your more private beheſts, and who, upon the ſign given, can put the Marmontels of England under *interdiction*, as effectually as we can do thoſe of France? Some of theſe mandates we have had the luck to ſee; not indeed decorated with the hat and the taſſels; but with certain *inſignia* which mark the *Boutique* and the *Maitre Ouvrier* with equal preciſion: and as we learn from theſe, that *goodneſs* has no more to do with *orthodoxy* in *your* climate than in *ours*, why would your Grace impute a circumſtance, as a blameable prejudice in us, which lays your Grace and your fellow-craftsmen ſo open to recrimination?

Indeed, my Lord, I was tempted to think from ſome parts of your letter, that your Grace took it for granted we never ſaw or heard of, in this

country, certain theological mandates in yours, not indeed iſſued originally by your Grace, but committed however to your Grace for execution. Theſe mandates import, that, *it is neceſſary that ſo many ſhould be reprobated;* and if any man ſhould come before your Grace, and flatly refuſe to ſubſcribe this propoſition, or one equivalent to it, upon the pretence that it is an inhuman and wicked propoſition, I am informed, that it is incumbent upon your Grace to iſſue a mandate, by the execution of which, the party recuſant would be reduced to a much worſe condition than any Mr. Marmontel had to fear from ours. Some Marmontels indeed among *you*, have, as I am told, thought it wrong and unreaſonable that ſuch mandates ſhould be current in your country. Great pains however have been taken on the other ſide, in large and voluntary tracts, to prove both the *right* and the *reaſonableneſs* of ſuch mandates, and as a large quantity of this proof hath been exhibited under your Grace's inſpection, it is the more ſurpriſing, that your Grace ſhould be ſo very jocoſe upon our *prolixity*.

We have heard of your Grace's predeceſſor Tillotſon, and if the foregoing particulars are juſt and well grounded, we think his example might be as edifying to your Grace as to us.

I doubt not but his Holineſs will accept your compliment with his uſual condeſcenſion. You are both good ſort of men, and, as I verily think, in the ſame way. You have both the intereſt of the church at heart, and ſo have I. And therefore, I own, I cannot ſee why we ſhould differ as to the mode of promoting that intereſt. I own a little

gri

grimace may do well for us all in its proper place; but I really think your Grace, on the preſent occaſion, has carried the joke too far. Marmontel and his friends may not ſmoke it; but great would be my anxieties, ſhould there be the leaſt chance, that the letter you have done me the honour to write to me, ſhould find its way to England. I need not explain myſelf farther to a perſon of your Grace's apprehenſion and ſagacity. I am,

My very good Lord,
Your Grace's affectionate brother,
And obedient ſervant,
***** Cardinal, Archbiſhop of Paris.

P. S. Your Grace's interpretation of 1 *Pet.* v. 5. is admirable. But your Grace's generoſity in beſtowing it *all* upon us, muſt be limited. Indeed, my Lord, we cannot accept of the whole, either in modeſty or in conſcience, knowing, as we do, that your Grace and Co. have occaſion for full half of it.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Oct.* 1, 1768.

I Agree with Philo-Logos, in your paper of Tueſday laſt, ſo far as to think, that there are ſome things in the preface of the laſt tranſlators of the Bible under King James the Firſt, to which I wiſh our church governors would pay a due attention. Of this kind is their giving an excluſive ſufficiency to the holy ſcriptures for the inſtruction of mankind

of every rank. I call it an excluſive ſufficiency, as upon the principles there laid down, the eſtabliſhment of any human doctrines, whether as teſts of orthodoxy with reſpect to teachers, or conditions of communion for the laity, are utterly inadmiſſible by proteſtants, and no better than an unchriſtian uſurpation of power. Another thing commendable in them is, their detail of reaſons for amending the old tranſlations of the Bible, which will hold equally good for reviews of the public ſervice from time to time.

Our church-governors like not, it ſeems, to be limited in preſcribing their teſts, by this excluſive ſufficiency of the ſcriptures, and are equally averſe to reviſions and corrections of our liturgic and canonical forms. I ſhall leave it to Philo-Logos to conſider, whether this preface may not be confined to the folio Bibles, that the common people may not be aware of theſe two circumſtances, and pretend to reaſon upon them, to the great diſturbance and moleſtation of their betters.

The tranſlators indeed may ſeem to make the clergy amends for theſe overſights, by the curious plea they offer for *church maintenance*, and the ill humour they expreſs at Gregory Nazianzen for reflecting upon ſynods and convocations, and at Nauclerus for recording an opinion, derived from a miraculous voice, that what the clergy of Conſtantine's time were pleaſed to call the *maintenance* of the church, was in reality the *poiſon* of it. However, perhaps, this might be better concealed than expoſed to the reflection of the public, as ſome people, recollecting certain incidents recorded in more modern eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, might be led to think

think that Gregory and Nauclerus were very much in the right.

As Philo-Logos found admiſſion into the Guard Room at St. James's, I cannot but hope that he is not diſpleaſed that the prayer of the Tranſlators, concerning the reign of King James's children and his children's children, has not been anſwered as they meant it, and that he has not the remoteſt wiſh that the deviation in our policy from the *right line* may be corrected. And if not, I would farther hope, that he would not, upon ſecond thoughts, and in conſideration of the credit of the Tranſlators, deſire to ſee the following fulſome compliment ſtanding before the book of God, viz. —"The appearance of your Majeſty, as of the "ſun in its ſtrength, inſtantly diſpelled thoſe ſup-"poſed and ſurmiſed miſts, and gave unto all that "well affected, exceeding cauſe of comfort, eſpeci-"ally when we beheld the government eſtabliſhed "in your Highneſs and your hopeful ſeed, by an "undoubted title, and this alſo accompanied with "peace and tranquility at home and abroad." A little below, they call the King, "that ſanctified "perſon, who, under God, is the immediate au-"thor of the *true happineſs* of all his Majeſty's "loyal and religious people."

By the time this tranſlation was finiſhed, the loyal and religious people of England, had learned a little of this King's true character, and had a taſte of the *comfort* they were like to reap from it. But what was that to the churchmen, whoſe maintenance and dignity was ſo well ſecured and ſanctified to them by this *comfortable* King, as to leave them nothing to fear from the *ſelf-conceited* bre-

brethren, who were left in the *miſts* from which they had ſo happily emerged.

It is but juſtice to Philo-Logos to obſerve, that he does not *expreſly* recommend the dedication, with the ſame zeal as he does the *fine preface*. If therefore the curators of the future editions of the Bible, think fit to oblige him with the preface, I hope he will not inſiſt upon their exhibiting the dedication. I am,

SIR,

Your humble ſervant,

ELEASTHENES.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Oct.* 6, 1768.

IN a pamphlet lately publiſhed, under the title of *Pietas Oxonienſis*, in defence of the ſcholars lately expelled from the univerſity of Oxford, at page 68 there is the following note, which I beg you will give admittance to, at your full conveniency, and to the few ſtrictures that accompany it.

Page 68, note. By the 1ſt, 9th, and 10th of William III. for preventing the horrible crimes of blaſphemy and prophaneneſs; "Whoſoever ſhall "deny any one of the perſons in the Trinity to be "God, or ſhall deny in printing or writing the "doctrines of the bleſſed Trinity, as ſet forth in "the 39 articles, ſhall be incapable of holding any "eccle-

" eccleſiaſtica benefice. But theſe acts of par-
" liament have of late years lain dormant, and
" now a direct contrary puniſhment is frequently
" paſſed upon ſuch profane blaſphemers, i. e. a
" promotion to the higheſt eccleſiaſtical offices, as
" we may inſtance in the caſes of the late reverend
" and learned Dr. Samuel Clarke, Dr. Sykes, the
" Right Rev. Fathers in God, Dr. Benjamin Hoad-
" ley, late Lord Biſhop of Wincheſter, and Dr.
" Clayton, late Lord Biſhop of Clogher in Ire-
" land; not to mention the renowned Archbiſhop
" Tillotſon, who, if he did not go to the lengths
" of the before-mentioned Gentlemen, kindly wiſhed
" the church well rid of the Athanaſian creed, &c.
" &c. &c &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c."

By the very unuſual number of *et cæteras*, which the writer puts at the end of his note, he is ſuppoſed to allude to many reſpectable perſons of different degrees, higher or lower, in the church, who, like their brethren, into whoſe dead aſhes he rakes, are at preſent puniſhed, for their profane blaſphemies, as he calls them, with great eccleſiaſtical preferments.

One would have expected, at this time of the day, when ſo much light has been thrown upon the holy ſcriptures, that a language unauthoriſed by thoſe ſcriptures, and imported into the church from the vain philoſophy of Plato, would have been rejected by univerſal conſent, and all honour given to the learned and virtuous Dr. Clarke, and other worthies amongſt the clergy, who have only pleaded for liberty to ſpeak of things revealed by Almighty God in the words of the holy ſpirit,

and

and not in the dark unintelligible phraſe of ignorant philoſophers.

But one part, and the worſt part of methodiſm, as it is the worſt part of popery itſelf, is its narrow and bitter ſpirit, in damning all to hell-fire hereafter, and to all that can be inflicted upon them here, who do not hold with it in all its conſecrated notions. And this intolerant, injurious ſpirit of this their advocate, which it is to be feared theſe young men may have imbibed, makes one leſs regret the hard uſage they ſeem to have met with, and their being excluded out of the eſtabliſhed church. Our author, I warrant you, would have made fine work with the Doctors Clarke and Sykes, and the Biſhops Tillotſon, Hoadley, and Clayton, had he had the handling of them: And I make no doubt, if he had the power, would make his vengeance be felt by ſuch of the preſent clergy as he has in his eye. But they are ſafe from ſuch impotent attempts. Whatever he may deem, it does not follow that our governors do not ſee many things amiſs in our eccleſiaſtical ſyſtem, or wiſh to have them amended, although they have never hitherto found a fit opportunity to undertake ſo good a work. And leaſt of all does it follow, that they will not undertake it at ſome time or other.

Mr. Locke, in a letter to his friend Limborch, June 6, 1689, informs him, "that the Toleration "Act had at length paſſed, though not with that "latitude that he, and other chriſtians, like him, "unambitious, and lovers of truth, might have "wiſhed; but that it was a great point gained to "go ſo far." The want of latitude which theſe great

great men ſaw in our Toleration Act, was the putting human articles of faith upon a footing with the infallible word of God, and requiring miniſters to approve and ſubſcribe to them. This is a grievance which has been felt and complained of, both in the church and without it, from that day to this, and is now grown to ſuch an accumulated ſize, as to merit the attention of the legiſlature, which we hope it will find in due time. In the letter above-mentioned, Mr. Locke tells his friend, that the Quaker preachers might have been tolerated without ſubſcribing any confeſſion of faith, but that they had indiſcreetly offered one of their own accord, at which the more ſenſible and worthy men amongſt them were exceedingly grieved. A conceſſion of the ſame kind to all miniſters of the goſpel, which was offered to the Quakers, would ſet all right among us, by a ſingle act of the legiſlature.

A member of the Houſe of Commons Parliament, of the firſt rank and character there, did very lately publicly lament the caſe of our churchwardens throughout the kingdom being univerſally perjured; for they are obliged to ſwear to do, what none of them ever do, or think of doing; and no one has the leaſt doubt, but they would perform their office full as well without their oath. No leſs does the unavoidable unhappy caſe of the thinking ſerious part of us of the clergy demand a public attention and redreſs. Whoever compares the articles of our church with the converſation, preaching, and writings of its clergy, will ſee the like prevarication with their ſacred ſtipulations univerſally prevail. It may be ſaid, and is ſaid,

that

that a man ſhould leave the church, and not eat its bread, when he finds he cannot approve of its articles. This may perhaps be right counſel; but it is hard to be followed, eſpecially with a large hungry family. And few have the courage and virtue of honeſt incomparable old Whiſton, or of Dr. Robertſon of our own days.

But to finiſh where I began. The author of Pietas Oxonienſis, page 19, informs us, that the late Archbiſhop of Canterbury was educated in the profeſſion of a man-midwife amongſt the diſſenters; and he praiſes his Grace even in extravagant terms. But he would have abated much of his panegyric, if he had attended to what Mr. Whiſton in his own life relates, that in a converſation with Dr. Secker, Biſhop of Oxford, the Biſhop told him, that Athanaſius's creed was firſt taken into, and left remaining in our liturgy, to invite over the papiſts to us; which ſpeech, I think, will amount to Archbiſhop Tillotſon's *more honeſt* wiſh, that we were well rid of it. I hope we ſhall not go on any longer complimenting the papiſts, as we find no good fruits from it, and they daily gain from us by the abundance of our complaiſance in this and other reſpects.

I am,

SIR,

Your humble ſervant,

The Curate of the Pariſh.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Oct.* 18, 1768.

THE defence which the writers in favour of adminiſtration have ſet up againſt the complaints of the public in reference to ſome late domeſtic tranſactions is, that their proceedings were *legal*. Wilkes's impriſonment, we are told, was the ſentence of the law. It was the law which acquitted Meſſieurs Gillam and Maclane. It is the law which lays hold on Bingley, and other publiſhers of obnoxious papers. Be it ſo. But if the HEIRS of liberty, of Britiſh revolution-liberty, muſt confine themſelves to the ſtrict obſervance of the law, and ſubmit to it, when it ſeems to bear hard on equity in ſome caſes, and on humanity in others, let them, in the name of common honeſty, have the benefit of it, when their own particular ſafety and protection depends upon the execution of it, and when their claim to it is clear and indiſputable. I do not mean to ſolicit this benefit againſt oppreſſive and deſpotic premiers. They are, or ſhould be, amenable to another tribunal. If that tribunal ſees fit to paſs by the iniquities of a wicked adminiſtration, whether in ſquandering the public treaſure, engroſſing it to themſelves and their confidential drudges, or in employing tools of profligate manners and principles, or in any other

ther inſtance of injury and oppreſſion ſecret or open, for which miniſterial power affords infinite opportunities and temptations;—if I ſay, a certain tribunal thinks proper to overlook miſdemeanors of this kind, it would be in vain for an individual ſufferer to ſeek his redreſs in our courts of law. If the *action would lie*, as the faculty expreſſes it, the culprit would certainly be acquitted upon as clear and weighty conſiderations at leaſt, as operated in favour of the juſtice and the muſquetier. I will not pretend to ſay what might or might not have been the funereal couſequences in St. George's Fields, had more circumſpection, temper, and lenity been uſed towards the populace. I am even willing to allow that the conſtitution might have been overturned, if the vigilance of the police, and the activity of the military, had not nicked the time in nailing the weaver, and the young man in the cow-houſe; and that being preſuppoſed, it would have been hard, if the law would not have protected the patriots and the heroes who ſaved their country at ſo ſmall an expence. Let us however turn the tables a little, and ſee whether they who have been ſo ready to ſhelter themſelves and us under the wing of the law in theſe caſes, are equally diſpoſed to protect us by this ſame law in others, where we think the riſque is at leaſt equal with that from which we eſcaped on the memorable 10th of May.

For inſtance. The HEIRS of Revolution-liberty above-mentioned affirm, that one main intention of thoſe patriots who brought about that bleſſed event, was, among other privileges, to ſecure them for the time to come, againſt the Dæmon of popery.

pery. To this end they procured divers wholesome laws, which the moment they were enacted, became the birthright of every proteſtant Engliſhman. This *ſecurity* was accordingly at different periods the grand object of the legiſlature. The foundation of it was the Bill of Rights, and the grand barrier of it, the Act ſettling the Crown upon the proteſtant line of the illuſtrious Houſe of Brunſwic. I apprehend theſe laws are ſtill in full force, and that the civil and religious ſecurity both of the Sovereign and the ſubject, are as much intereſted to have them executed as ever. I will even venture to affirm, there never was more occaſion for it ſince the revolution. I affirm it upon good authority, that the numbers of papiſts among us never roſe ſo high ſince that period, as they do now; that the inſolence of papiſts of all ranks was never ſo viſible; that the ſwarms of prieſts and jeſuits amount higher in number by many degrees than ever was known ſince the expulſion of James II. and that their impudence in making converts, promoting diviſions among his Majeſty's proteſtant ſubjects, and poiſoning the minds of the people with diſaffection to his perſon and government, are too notorious to be concealed or ſmothered even by thoſe officious mongrels, who have to the amazement of their fellow proteſtants, danced to their pipe. I appeal to their writings, whether in formal tracts, or news-paper eſſays, for the little caution they uſe either in advancing their own pernicious principles, or vilifying the national religion, and particularly the fountain of it, the reformation from popery under thoſe excellent Princes Edward and Elizabeth? Could theſe appearances

poſſibly

poſſibly conſiſt with a due execution of the laws againſt theſe offenders? For offenders they are againſt the law of the land,—offenders whoſe principles and practices are equally pernicious, and have a more certain tendency to deſtroy the peace and welfare of our country, than the worſt of thoſe villanies for which Sir John Fielding and other reſpectable Magiſtrates ſend ſo many to Tyburn and America. You will tell me, the laws are too ſevere to be executed ſtrictly in this caſe. But can any laws be too ſevere againſt thoſe whoſe ſtudy it is, and whoſe endeavours are directed, as far as they dare, to deſtroy our very conſtitution? And pray who are the beſt judges of this ſeverity? Are not they who compoſe the great Council of the nation? Have they in any inſtance mitigated the ſeverity of theſe laws? And if they have not, has any man, or any other ſet of men a power to ſuſpend them?

There was, Mr. Printer, in your Chronicle not many days ago, ſome ſalutary and judicious propoſals for amending the laws againſt popery. I have no objection to them, or to any other expedient of the kind which the legiſlature ſhall ſee fit to adopt. But in the mean time, there are other laws in force, and I, and thouſands, and ten thouſands more of his Majeſty's liege ſubjects, go in continual jeopardy of loſing every advantage we enjoy by being ſubjects of Great Britain, merely for want of attention to the *illegal* licentiouſneſs of papiſts. Have we not as much right to have the laws executed for our ſecurity againſt papiſts, as thoſe laws which protect us againſt thieves, murderers, rioters, coiners, houſebreakers, and high-

waymen? Are not one ſort of laws as much our birthright as another; and hath any miniſter or magiſtrate the power of diſpenſing with theſe laws, or with any other laws while they are unrepealed by the ſenate?—I ſhould not wonder that a Miniſter of State, who ſhould think the hiſtory of Great Britain compoſed by Father Orleans, to be preferable to all others, ſhould encourage papiſts, recommend them to court favour, and even to ſalaries for doing public buſineſs. But I ſhould think ſuch a one very unfit to be a Miniſter, and I ſhould be ſorry, heartily ſorry, if the great Council of the nation ſhould overlook crimes of this nature in a Miniſter though ever ſo powerful. And I ſhould think any Magiſtrate very unfit for his office, who either intimidated, or allured by other conſiderations, ſhould pay ſo much regard to the principles, opinions, or example of ſuch Miniſter, as to connive at theſe dangerous and deſperate enemies within our own bowels.

I may probably, Mr. Printer, trouble you in a little time with a detail of facts ſufficient to alarm every affectionate ſubject of our gracious King, to ſhew that theſe remonſtrances and expoſtulations are not without foundation. But what I moſt inſiſt upon, and what I now repeat, is, that every ſuch ſubject has a RIGHT to the execution of theſe laws, the ſame right that they have to the execution of any other laws tending to their ſecurity and protection from fraud and violence. Theſe are not my ſentiments alone. They are the ſentiments of thouſands of Britiſh proteſtants beſides. The papiſts are rich and powerful, and they are encreaſing their property every day; and one hears

ſerious

ſerious people continually aſking with conſternation, where will theſe things end? If this queſtion is not attended to in due time, it is but too probable that the end will come upon us ſooner than we are aware, and perhaps when we are deſtitute of the means to ward off the blow.

I am,

SIR,

Your humble ſervant,

PROOF.

ST. JAMES'S CHRONICLE, *Oct.* 18, 1768.

To the PRINTER.

SIR,

THE Apologiſer for a late metropolitan, under the ſignature of *Favenius*, is not willing that his Grace's legacy of one thouſand pounds towards the eſtabliſhment of a Biſhop or Biſhops in America ſhould be conſidered as left with a view of epiſcopiſing the colonies. Let us therefore take a ſhort ſketch of this Prelate's proceedings in his life-time concerning this affair, and ſee whether we cannot come at a little more of his mind and views, than this Apologiſt apprehended, or at leaſt chooſes to own.

In this Prelate's propagation-ſermon before the ſociety in the year 1741, we have the following paſ-

paſſage. " If the proviſion which we [the ſociety] " have made for the people of our own commu- " nion, hath proved inſtrumental, at the ſame " time, to bring others over into it, we hope " there is very far from being any harm done. " Indeed *unity of profeſſion* amongſt ourſelves, ef- " fected by peace and charity, will greatly recom- " mend our religion to infidels; who elſe may be " tempted to continue as they are, for want of " knowing with whom to join." Is not this ſpeaking pretty plain, and particularly in a begging ſermon for a *farther proviſion?* Can this orator, who thought the very converſion of the infidels depended upon epiſcopiſing the American colonies, be ſuppoſed to have no view in his bequeſt to ſuch an event? What argument do the Romiſh Convertiſſeurs-general rely upon more than that taken from the neceſſity for unity of profeſſion among chriſtians to prevent ſcandal and uncertainty among infidels.

It is certain that this Prelate was a moſt active member of the Propagation Society, ſo far as related to the epiſcopiſing project. *It is true his zeal for this favourite meaſure, was under ſome reſtraint, while he was in an inferior ſee, from the influence of the more conſiderate members at the head of the ſociety.* But no ſooner did it come to his turn to preſide, than he diſcovered with what eagerneſs and ſpirit he determined to proſecute this great work. For this purpoſe the waters were firſt moved by a Miſſionary, ſince taken under his Grace's wing, who modeſtly aſſured the public, that, " the Indian converſions were undertaken by " the ſociety only incidentally, and as it were *ex*

" *abundanti*, while their principal aim was to re-
" medy in the firſt place the ill ſtate of religion in
" our colonies themſelves." And that he might not be thought to ſpeak *ſine permiſſu ſuperiorum*, he clenches his doctrine in the end of his pamphlet, with a long paſſage from the ſermon above cited.

Moſt unhappily, however, for himſelf and his patron, he fell into the hands of the incomparable Dr. *Mayhew*, who expoſed his craftsmanſhip in a manner that alarmed the friends of chriſtian liberty, both on his own and our ſide of the Atlantic, with apprehenſions for the conſequences of ſo bold an attack on the common rights of Britiſh proteſtants. The detection, however, was ſeaſonable, and ſo mortifying to the Grand Maſter, that he would truſt the *Anſwer* to no hand but his own; and here he ſhewed his dexterity, partly by evading, and partly by ſoftening the charge Dr. *Mayhew* had ſo plainly fixed upon his armour-bearer. The Doctor rejoined, and ſo effectually unraveled the ſophiſtry, as not to leave his opponents the leaſt ſubterfuge, nor his readers the leaſt doubt, but that the intention of the late Metropolitan was to reduce all the Britiſh colonies under epiſcopal authority: And if Dr. *Mayhew* hath left *Favenius* any room to doubt of this, let him repair to Dr. *Thomas Bradbury Chandler*, who hath ſupplied all deficiencies, having not only delineated the plan, but propoſed the method of raiſing the epiſcopal revenue, and pointed out in his Prolegomena, the great perſonage to whoſe unremitting attention, and indefatigable endeavours, it was owing, that matters were in ſo hopeful a way, little think-

thinking, I dare ſay, when he let go the cat with ſuch alacrity, that the operations of his principal would be cloſed with a legacy of a meagre thouſand.

It is to little purpoſe that *Favenius* endeavours to ſcreen his client by referring us to the example of four other Biſhops. No body doubts, who knew them, but that Biſhop *Butler*, to the laſt hour of his life, went hand in hand with the late Metropolitan in his ſcheme of church politics. The worthy, good-natured Biſhop *Benſon*, exerciſed in ſubſtantial acts of benevolence to all mankind, relied upon *their* wiſdom for all matters of this ſort, his friendſhip for the men, ſtifling all ſuſpicions of their particular views.

Archbiſhop *Teniſon* lived when the project was young, when the ſtate of religion in the colonies was little known, and when many plauſible things were alledged for ſending Biſhops thither, which have, ſince his death, appeared to be fictions and miſrepreſentations. For the reſt, how unlike he was to ſome of his ſucceſſors, may be underſtood by the virulent abuſe of him in the laſt edition of Godwin *de Præſulibus Angliæ*, for not ſufficiently encouraging a project ſet on foot, or at leaſt promoted by ſome hot-headed high flying divines, for bleſſing *Pruſſia* with Biſhops after the Engliſh model. This editor, it ſeems, had been too gentle in his reflections upon Dr. *Teniſon* for his lukewarmneſs in this buſineſs: The paſſage therefore, at the inſtance of Archbiſhop *Potter* was cancelled, and the good Dr. *Teniſon* properly chaſtiſed in a new leaf, for his procraſtination, timidity, and unſeaſonable caution.

I wiſh I could ſay more for Biſhop *Kennet* than ſome parts of his conduct will admit of. His laſt work, namely, his Hiſtorical Regiſter (wherein his view was to gloſs over the ſtrange proceedings in religious matters after the reſtoration of Charles II.) is a perfect contraſt to a thouſand things he had both ſpoken and written in favour of chriſtian liberty before. With reſpect to this notion of the benefit expected from ſending Biſhops to America, it may be found in his letter to Mr. Colman, dated July 28, 1716, wherein he ſpeaks of the miſſionaries of thoſe times, as being (ſome few excepted) "Men who offered themſelves to that ſervice— "chiefly to find refuge from poverty and ſcandal. "Such men, when they come to the places allotted "to them, forget their miſſion; and inſtead of "propagating chriſtianity, are only contending "for rites and ceremonies, or for powers and pri- "vileges, and are diſputing with the veſtries of "every pariſh, and even with the civil government "of every province. Theſe two miſchiefs, ſays "he, can hardly be redreſſed but by fixing ſchools "and univerſities in thoſe parts, and ſettling, we "hope, two Biſhops, one for the continent, ano- "ther for the iſlands, with advice and aſſiſtance "of preſbyters to ordain fit perſons, eſpecially "natives, and to take care of all the churches."

But ſchools and univerſities have, ſince thoſe days, been fixed in thoſe countries with great and good effect; and it is to be hoped the later miſſionaries have been, and are better ſort of men, and conſequently no occaſion for Biſhops on that ſcore. If they are ſtill of the ſame ſtamp, let it be ſhewn how Biſhops would mend them. As for Doctor Ken-

Kennet's not knowing in 1716, why the colony churches ſhould be jealous of Biſhops, it might poſſibly have been ſo, if his intellects had been on a level with thoſe of *Favenius*. But conſidering the intelligence he had, and his knowledge of the coloniſts' averſion to their ancient perſecutors, his expreſſion can hardly imply leſs than a very ſtrong ſuſpicion, that they *would* be jealous of them.

Let not *Favenius* pretend, that this anſwer to his letter is indecently raking into the aſhes of the dead. I go no farther than a matter of fact. It is poſſible, the late Metropolitan may have been an honeſt, though an erroneous zealot for American epiſcopacy. That point I pretend not to determine. When men, in high ſtations, go wrong, either in religion or politics, they are apt to draw numbers after them, to the great detriment of the public weal: And in ſuch caſes, it is not their titles that ſhould protect their ſchemes from being ſet in a proper light, as a warning both to the preſent and future generations to guard againſt all overbearing attempts to ſtifle the truth, or to encroach on the liberties of reaſonable men, chriſtians, and proteſtants. I am,

SIR, &c.

PARRHASIUS.

LONDON CHRONICLE, *Nov.* 8, 1768.

To the PRINTER.

SIR,

AMONGST the various articles of intelligence and inſtruction, which your uſeful paper conveys to the public, I am particularly attentive to thoſe which relate to religious matters. And, as it is my cuſtom, after I have laid down your Chronicle, to recollect what I have learned from the obſervations of your correſpondents, it ſometimes ſurprizes me to find certain notions advanced, which I cannot reconcile with proteſtant principles. One of the advocates for epiſcopacy, who appears in your paper, under the ſignature of *Crito*, hath informed us of two things, which ſhould afford matter of ſerious reflection to all conſiſtent and true proteſtants. With him and many others, it ſeems to be a point of the laſt importance, that Biſhops ſhould be ſent to America. But one queſtion is, "Where are they to fix their "reſidence?" *Crito* plainly tells us, "that though "the number of preſbyterians in New England is "an objection, the number of papiſts in Canada "would be none." Now, Sir, what are we to conclude from ſuch an aſſertion as this? Muſt we believe, that the dignitaries of our church have a greater

greater affection for thoſe of the Romiſh communion, than for our brethren who have renounced the groſs and idolatrous errors of popery? Or, as it hath been thought proper to ſend a popiſh Biſhop to Canada, is it judged neceſſary, that a proteſtant Prelate ſhould be there too, to exhibit an edifying example, either of hierarchical ſplendor, or chriſtian humility and contempt of the world? No, *Crito* ſays, "If he goes to Boſton or New York, "he might probably meet with the fate of the "Archbiſhop of St. Andrew's." This would be hard indeed; and it would be pity to ſend our Biſhops to be knocked on the head. But, if the ſcheme of epiſcopizing our colonies goes forward, 'tis hoped, no ſuch inſtruments will be employed, as Archbiſhop Sharp. If any credit is to be paid to hiſtory, he was a time-ſerving, ambitious, and hypocritical man. He played faſt and looſe with all parties, and practiſed every deceitful art to accompliſh his mercenary ends. For this, I have the teſtimony of one of his own order, the honeſt and reſpectable Biſhop Burnet, who knew him well. I do not mean to palliate the guilt of his murder. 'Tis well known, it was committed by a few lawleſs ruffians, with whom I am ſorry to find the inhabitants of Boſton and New York ſo invidiouſly compared.

Another piece of intelligence, which *Crito* has communicated to us, I own, greatly aſtoniſhed me. He informs us, that the anſwer to Dr. Mayhew's *obſervations* was written by the late Archbiſhop himſelf. In that anſwer it is affirmed, that "po-"piſh Biſhops reſide here, and go about to exer-"ciſe every part of their function, without offence "and without obſervation." When

When I read that pamphlet, I was ſtartled, and willing to doubt of the truth of the fact, as I muſt ever think the popiſh ſuperſtition irreconcileable with true chriſtianity, and muſt dread its progreſs, as ſubverſive of our liberties, both civil and religious. But, *Crito* puts the matter out of doubt by archiepiſcopal authority; from whence it is plain, that ſome of our eccleſiaſtical ſuperiors would not have us be alarmed at the ſpread of popery. What ſhall we ſay, Sir, when thoſe who are appointed watchmen over our Iſrael, and placed at the head of a proteſtant church, can connive at the practices of our implacable, bigotted enemies, and even urge their own indolence, and unconcern for the proteſtant intereſt at home, as a plea for extending their power over our brethren in America? Many things have been lately publiſhed to the world, that reflect no great honour upon the character of a late metropolitan. And, it behoves thoſe who would be thought to have a regard for his memory, not to enter into a very particular vindication of what at preſent may be deemed by ſome an *ambiguous fame*; leſt, in the courſe of a fuller explanation, certain proceedings ſhould be brought to light, which ſavour more of an inquiſitorial ſpirit, than of that equitable and catholic temper, which ſo well becomes the miniſters of the meek and benevolent Jeſus.

I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

K—, Oct. —, A PROTESTANT.

1768.

To

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Nov.* 10, 1768.

THERE is nothing more unworthy or more unbecoming the character of a chriſtian divine, than that mean adulation which ſome of our modern church-aſpirants pay to their reſpective patrons in thoſe addreſſes known by the name of *Dedications*; nor can there be a ſeverer reflection on the good ſenſe of the patrons, than thoſe inſinuations thrown out by many of theſe Dedicators, that the great man to whom they ſacrifice, is not only delighted with the ſteam, but in perfect agreement with the author's ſentiments, on the ſubject of his lucubrations.

Many are the offenders of this ſtamp, which have fallen in my way within the compaſs of a very few years; the laſt I have ſeen, exhibits himſelf in a dedication to a noble Lord, placed before a ſermon on popery, lately publiſhed, by a Gentleman who informs us, that he is *in ſome degree of public eſtimation.** And who endeavours to add to this *eſtimation*, by "proclaiming an uniformity of thinking, with "a man confeſſedly of the beſt head and heart."

That the man ſuppoſed here to be meant, is *confeſſedly* a Nobleman of ſuperior learning and capacity, is well known.† But this would hardly be ſo univerſally confeſſed, could the world be brought to believe that his Lordſhip is uniform in his ſentiments

* Dr. D—*dl.*

† The late Lord *Cheſterfield.*

timents with this dedicator: who in his great wiſdom, deſcribes "a ſort of dirty, deſpicable crea-"tures, who would wiſh *to make themſelves conſpi-"cuous*," by offending and attacking thoſe, whom, in the beginning of the ſentence, he ſuppoſes, they would not offend or attack, if they were not *ſafe in their obſcurity*. But why ſhould not they who can *diſcover imperceptible* inſects (a piece of nonſenſe he aſcribes to a favourite author of his patron's) be able to diſcern *conſpicuous* objects in *obſcurity?*

Thus far in compliment to the *head* of his patron. But, it ſeems, he muſt not only *think* with his dedicator, but *ſmile* with him too, "reſpecting ſome "impotent attacks in news-papers—the effuſions "of bigotry and malevolence—on an elegant paint-"ing in HIS chapel."

I well remember theſe attacks, Mr. Printer, both in your uſeful Chronicle, and in ſome other papers, and was very far from thinking them either impotent or ridiculous. It was not the *elegance* of the painting that was diſputed; nor is it the *elegance* of the painting that will hinder its being an *idolatrous* painting in the place it occupies, at leaſt in the ſenſe of the proteſtant church of England, delivered in her excellent homilies *againſt the peril of idolatry*, where the ſame ſort of bigotry and malevolence (if ſo ſuch cenſures muſt be called) are more ſeverely expreſſed by many degrees, than in any of the news-paper attacks, mentioned by the Dedicator.

He tells us he has been traduced as a papiſt. A miſtake which might eaſily be made by a ſerious proteſtant, without either bigotry or malevolence. He acknowledges there is an altar-piece in a place

of

of public worſhip, which he calls, "My chapel:" and where we muſt ſuppoſe, he has the ſole direction. But an altar-piece implies an altar, and the proteſtant church of England, having nothing to ſacrifice, either to gods or heroes, hath no altars, much leſs have the proteſtant diſſenters any: Altars and altar-pieces are adjuncts of popery, and if divines will talk in the language, and adopt the furniture of popery, what wonder if they who are not let into the ſecret, ſhould rank them with a denomination of religioniſts, to whom, till they think fit to deny it, they may appear by theſe outward characteriſtic marks, to belong.

The ſermon however I hope may ſet all theſe miſtaken men right, and though it may ſeem to have been ſqueezed out of the preacher by the bigotry and malevolence aforeſaid, and *in compliance with a general opinion*, rather than his own opinion of any *neceſſity* for it, I think it ought to amount to a proof with every *unprejudiced* perſon, not only that the preacher, but that the printer of it likewiſe is a ſincere proteſtant.

I am,

SIR, &c.

DIDYMUS.

Nov. 12, 1768.

Extract of a letter from a Gentleman, on a journey of pleaſure through the north of England.

" ON the whole, I obſerved with great ſatis-
" faction many remarkable improvements in
" Lancaſhire: Poor fiſhing towns become the ſeats
" of extenſive commerce, and their fiſhing boats
" converted into ſtately merchant ſhips, traverſing
" moſt parts of the globe, and bringing wealth
" from every quarter. Inſtead of thatched houſes
" and deſpicable cottages, ſuperb edifices the mag-
" nificent ſeats of opulence and grandeur, the
" happy effects of liberty and commerce, which I
" contemplated with no little elation; but this
" was greatly diminiſhed, on my viewing their
" caſtle at Lancaſter, where I met with the fol-
" lowing object, namely, an ancient woman in her
" 79th year, who has been a priſoner there near
" eighteen years. I wondered what inexorable
" creditor, or heinous crime, had occaſioned ſo
" long an imprisonment, and found this to be the
" caſe: This poor woman apprehended ſhe had
" an undoubted right to a certain ſeat in the
" church of St. Peter's, in Liverpool; in endea-
" vouring to maintain her right, ſhe occaſioned
" ſome diſturbance to her antagoniſt, who got her
" into the Biſhop's Court, by which ſhe was ex-
" com-

" communicated with the greater excommunica-
" tion, and in conſequence was attached by a writ
" from the Sheriff, and committed to this caſtle in
" December 1750, and hath continued there ever
" ſince, upon the county allowance of one ſhilling
" per week: ſhe hath been ſome time aſſiſted by
" private charity, but very inſufficient for reaſon-
" able ſupport. She was clean though in rags,
" and had in her countenance the traces of better
" days. Judge of her ſituation, enfeebled with
" old age, emaciated with cloſe impriſonment,
" deſtitute of every relief, oppreſſed with every
" want! I found all the pleaſing ideas of liberty
" and opulence ſo contracted by this poor woman's
" caſe, as to wipe the former out of my mind, and
" cloſe my journey with a painful reflection, that in
" in this land of liberty, diſtinguiſhed above all
" others, there ſhould remain a court ſo near a-
" kin to the inquiſition, diſgraceful to chriſtianity,
" and repugnant to every feeling of the human
" mind."

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Nov.* 22, 1768.

THE caſe of the poor woman, formerly of this town, but now in Lancaſter Caſtle, ſet forth in your Chronicle of Nov. 12, together with the reflection at the end of the paragraph, on " a

" court

" court ſo near a-kin to the inquiſition, diſgrace-
" ful to chriſtianity, and repugnant to every feel-
" ing of the human mind," might, it is to be feared, have left ſome awkward impreſſions upon the readers of that article with reſpect to epiſcopacy, if you had not moſt ſeaſonably and prudently furniſhed us with an antidote againſt all pernicious anti-epiſcopal errors, on the other ſide of the leaf. It is not indeed to be denied, that the poor woman was excommunicated by epiſcopal authority, and, in conſequence of that, taken and impriſoned by virtue of the writ *de excom. cap.* for eighteen long years: And it is true too, that this affair has at firſt ſight but an odd aſpect in a *proteſtant* land of liberty. But as I hinted above, your worthy and orthodox correſpondent F. A. hath ſaid enough on the other ſide of the leaf, to ſatisfy any ſcruples, and to ſink any prejudices that might ariſe in the breaſt of a weak chriſtian on this head, by *affirming*, on his own, and the teſtimony of another orthodox brother, that " there was a ſucceſſion of real " Biſhops, an order above Preſbyters, in the " chriſtian church, from the time of the Apoſtles." And as the validity of all clerical ordinations depends upon the ſaid ſucceſſion, it follows that all Biſhops of the preſent age belong to it: and conſequently have *apoſtolical authority*. This ſhews how things may be miſrepreſented by curſory and miſtaken travellers. It now appears that this wicked old woman was a rebel againſt *apoſtolical authority*, and conſequently no chriſtian, as Mr. F. A. and his coadjutor the parſon aforeſaid, have proved non-epiſcopal diſſenters both in Old and New

New England to be, for want of the due and rightful adminiſtration of ſacraments: and conſequently the ſacrament of baptiſm, which however he did well not to mention expreſsly, leſt ſome of the peſtilent New Englanders might have aſked, Who baptized the late A—b—p of C—b—y? Is it then to be diſputed, that this antichriſtian old female richly deſerved her correction for her contumacy towards an apoſtolical juriſdiction? Or is it to be wondered at that his late Grace of C———y ſhould "in the maturity of his deliberation, and "out of a conſcientious regard to the purity of "Chriſt's inſtituted religion," ſtrain every nerve while living, and (to ſhew that he died in the ſame *mature deliberation*) leave a legacy, to accommodate the Americans with a character ſo indiſpenſable to their ſpiritual welfare, as that of a biſhop? —Talk not to me of the abſurdity of excommunicating from all chriſtian ſociety, a poor woman only for aſſerting her *right* to ſit and hear the word of God in a chriſtian congregation. Every one knows, or (what is much the ſame thing in our preſent ſyſtem) every one ought to know, that where epiſcopal powers are wanting, or where they are held in contempt, chriſtianity is but a *naked* circumſtance, of no kind of validity towards procuring either preſent or future felicity, as hath been abundantly proved by F. A.'s ingenious friend the pamphleteer, in that elaborate work intituled, "A brief defence of the *divine* epiſcopal order, &c." which indeed carries the order a little higher than the apoſtles, as I do not remember that any of thoſe primitive teachers arrogated to themſelves

divi-

divinity: But we live in an *enlightened age*, as his late grace uſed frequently to obſerve, and that is ſufficient to ſolve all difficulties.

I am,

Yours, &c.

OCTAGONICUS.

Liverpool, Nov. 15.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Dec.* 15, 1768.

I READ in the public papers the other day, a paragraph, importing, that "whoever in the "Dutch plantations is detected in carrying off "green nutmegs, with a view to propagate them "elſewhere, is ſcalded to death in a copper of "boiling water." This put me in mind of what was mentioned in your Chronicle not long ago, that the Dutch tolerate the worſhip of the Devil in Batavia, without any hurtful conſequences, which, it ſeems, is made uſe of as an argument for tolerating popery in Great Britain.

The execution above-mentioned has ſo very much the air of a ſacrifice offered to the Devil, that one cannot but think it very conſonant to the toleration of his more profeſſed worſhip among the ſavages of Batavia, even without reſpect to *conſequences*, as the principles of the *tolerating* and the *tolerated* ſeem to be ſo much of the ſame complexion.

As

As to the toleration of popery in this kingdom, my buſineſs and connections in this metropolis afford me ſo many opportunities of knowing the principles of that horrid ſuperſtition, and the political ſentiments of numbers of individuals who profeſs and practiſe it, that the moment ſuch a toleration ſhould be obtained, I ſhould conclude that the nation was given up to a deſperate and incurable blindneſs, and was moving faſt towards its deſtruction, and ſhould expect the very ſame effects from it, that were dreaded from James the Second's declaration of an *unlimited* liberty of conſcience.

A report has been induſtriouſly ſpread, that ſome among the proteſtant diſſenters, have zealouſly argued for the toleration of popery. As I am a proteſtant diſſenter myſelf, and know not of one among my acquaintance to whom this can juſtly be imputed, I take it for granted this is one among the many calumnies which have been thrown out againſt that loyal body of people, perhaps to countenance the charge, which has been invidiouſly enough exaggerated againſt them, namely of addreſſing the ſaid James the Second with thanks for his declaration above-mentioned, which every wiſe man ſaw had an immediate tendency to the extinction of all civil and religious liberty in Britain.

That ſuch weak perſons there were among our forefathers, is not to be denied, and ſuch there ever will be among all numerous bodies of men of all denominations But it is well known that the greateſt as well as the moſt reſpectable part of our anceſtors, were ſo far from joining in thoſe ſcandalous

lous adulatory addreſſes to the prieſt-ridden tyrant, that they rather choſe to acquieſce under the abridgment of their own reaſonable liberty, than to countenance thoſe abject ſycophants, who ſo meanly deſcended to curry favour with the court, at the hazard of the ſafety of their country.

Providence, however, ſeems not yet to have abandoned us ſo far as to ſuffer us to fall into that wretched credulity, to which ſome late popiſh ſcribblers would endeavour to reduce us, concerning the innocence of the papiſts, and their reformation in the article of ſuperſtition. While theſe impudent and lying declaimers are aſſerting with the utmoſt effrontery, that the papiſts are no longer to be feared either on account of their revengeful ſpirit, or for that enthuſiaſtic ſuperſtition which heretofore drove them headlong into ſo much cruelty towards heretics, we are ſeaſonably appriſed in the public prints of the audacious villanies and menaces of a band of Iriſh papiſts in Eſſex; and as there are numbers of Iriſh prieſts both in town and country, it is not unreaſonable to ſuppoſe that this wretched crew are ſpirited up to theſe outrages, by way of trial how far our patience may be depended upon, and as a prelude to ſomething too probably hatching among them, of a ſtill more alarming nature.

On another hand, the account of the *ſtatue* of St. Januarius lately erected at Naples, with the inſcription on the pedeſtal, publiſhed in the Gazette, ſhews that our governors are not either unappriſed of the attachment of papiſts in all countries to the unbounded power of the Pope, or unaware of the ill effects of it, and therefore publiſh

liſh this as a warning piece to Engliſh proteſtants to be upon their guard againſt theſe infatuations of papal idolatry in their own country.

People may ſay what they pleaſe of the declining influence of papal power, and of the ſtate of humiliation to which the combined powers of the Houſe of Bourbon are like to reduce his Holineſs; but whilſt he has this hold on the minds of the common run of papiſts, he has little to fear. Whatever advantages may be gained over him for the preſent, his catholic oppoſers muſt come at laſt to a compromiſe with him, from which he will probably gain additional ſtrength inſtead of loſing any part of the power he now poſſeſſes. How powerful he is in Poland, the execution of his mandates againſt the diſſidents and the confuſion created by it, in that great kingdom, afford an amazing proof; he is ſufficiently aſſured that the ſame ſpirit prevails inwardly among the devotees nearer home. He hath accordingly lately taken heart, and hath no longer left in doubt what part he intends to take, or how inflexibly he is determined in the affair of the Prince of Parma.

I am, &c.

SLEIDAN.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Dec.* 24, 1768.

IN the firſt extract you gave us from the incomparable Mrs. Macaulay's hiſtory, in your Chronicle of Thurſday, Dec. 8, it is obſerved, that "till the light of letters are again extinct, another "Filmer will not ariſe to diſpute the equal juſtice "of God, and the natural freedom of mankind."

But behold him ariſen in the Gazetteer of the very next day, in the garb of *Phylometaph:* It is the ſame learned hand who ſome time ago endeavoured to confute Mr. Locke's principles of gogernment, and who, finding himſelf defeated in the open attack, now goes to work with that great maſter of reaſon, by way of ſap and mining. You ſhall have his plan in his own words:—"Much "converſation, ſays he, we have heard of late in "favour of revolution principles, and by a ſober "ſort of people too, in the defence of the proceed-"ings of a ſet of men, ſeemingly abandoned to "all ſenſe of morality: This firſt led me to think "there muſt be a difference, and then to enquire "what that difference was, between the principles "of chriſtianity and revolution principles. Some "referred me to Mr. Locke; I had recourſe to "his works; and in the ſhort account of his life, "I obſerved his *Eſſay* [on the Human Underſtand-"ing]

" ing] was his capital piece, which he had been " brooding over with great pleaſure for about " twenty years—and behold the product! an utter " denial of all inbred principles, directly contrary " to the ninth article of our religion."

And ſo, kind reader, Mr. Phylometaph thinks it neceſſary to approach Mr Locke's revolution principles, by firſt placing a few barrels of powder under his Eſſay.

And how do you think he ſets about it?—— Why truly by ſending our young ſtudents for their metaphyſics to the ſyſtem of Duns Scotus for accurate definitions of ſenſe and ſenſation, reaſon, and reflection, where, perhaps, by the time they have loſt their teeth and their eye-ſight, they may come to find out that they have thrown away their lucubrations on abſurdity and nonſenſe, unleſs by good luck they may be ſatisfied with the ſpecimens given of them by this impenetrable philoſopher.

One pleaſant objection he makes to Mr. Locke's definition of *ſubſtance*, is, that it would make nonſenſe of the Athanaſian creed, which is no doubt an irreparable injury done to that ſenſible and perſpicuous compoſition. Oft have I heard the admirers of that creed inſiſt, that we ought implicitly to receive and believe it, without enquiring too minutely into the ſenſe and meaning of it. But I muſt own this is the very firſt time I ever heard any danger there was of maiming the good ſenſe of it by a philoſophical definition, after it has ſtood the brunt of ſcholaſtic interpretation for ſo many long years.

M. D'Alembert, giving us an account of the Jeſuits

Jeſuits in his admirable little book on their deſtruction, informs us, how aſſiduous theſe reverend fathers were to get all the promiſing youths of France into their ſchools and ſeminaries, and what conteſts they had with the univerſity of Paris on that head. This Gentleman's addreſs to the ſchool boys of Great Britain and the Britiſh colonies, and his warning them to beware when Locke's Eſſay is put into their hands, at Cambridge in particular (there is leſs hazard of this it ſeems at Oxford) announces himſelf to be of the very ſame order.

Mr. Locke is the deteſtation, and ever muſt be, of this kind of men, and is accordingly attacked by them and their aſſociates upon different topics.

If I remember right, Mr. Printer, you gave us, ſome time ago, an extract from a book, wherein it was attempted to be ſhewn, that Locke was not an original author, but that he was beholden to Ariſtotle for the principles of his philoſophy, particularly with reſpect to his notions of ſenſation and reflection.

School boys and Collegians who are ſtudious, generally like to ſee all they can upon intereſting ſubjects, and there is no doubt but this ingenious performance will be recommended to them from ſome quarter. How will Phylometaph contrive to guard againſt this hypotheſis, for *his* poſition is, that Locke "attempts to lead them into the dark "paths of ſenſation and reflection, by the glim-"mering tapers of his own ideas?" Perhaps he may think there is no danger from this writer; for

if

if they are only ſent to Ariſtotle and his ſcholaſtic commentators, they will infallibly come about to his point, and reſt, in the end, in the wholeſome metaphyſics of the Athanaſian Creed.

Is it not incredible, that, in an age when we pretend to ſo many improvements both in ſcriptural and philoſophical learning, any man beyond the ſtate of idiotiſm ſhould have the aſſurance to bring out to public view ſuch an amazing piece of ſtupidity as this before us? I am not ſurpriſed it ſhould find its way into a public print; I would have every thing publiſhed even of this kind, that the public may be appriſed what ſort of heads and hearts we have among us. But ſurely it is ſufficient that ſuch geniuſes find a place for their performances, amongſt the nonſenſe of the day, without being invited to ſend out more of their poiſonous traſh to pervert the ſenſe and judgment of our ingenuous young men in the purſuit of truth, and to corrupt the fidelity of the well-meaning, but oftentimes untutored, ſubjects of our gracious King, by reviling the laws, under which he enjoys his authority.

I ſhall conclude with applying to Mr. Locke, what the worthy and learned Dr. Jortin hath ſaid of Archbiſhop Tillotſon, "Amongſt many things "which may be mentioned in favour of Mr. Locke, "this ſhould not be forgotten, that of thoſe who "have paſſed their judgments upon him, there "never was a *ſon of abſurdity*, who did not *diſlike*, "or a *ſenſible reader* who did not *approve* his writ-"ings. If a perſon were to offer himſelf a candi-"date for honeſt reputation, what could he wiſh

"or

" or hope for more, than to ſhare LOCKE's fate,
" and to find the ſame cenſurers, and the ſame de-
" fenders." *Birch's life of Tillotſon*, 8vo. p. 489.

I am,

SIR,

Your humble ſervans,

VIGILIUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Dec.* 29, 1768.

I Happened to miſs your paper of the 12th of November in its uſual courſe, and by that means did not read F. A.'s letter therein till a day or two ſince. A letter that ſeems more remarkable for the zeal than for the charity of the writer. It begins thus: " Every one knows that the mem-
" bers of the eſtabliſhed church, whether in Old
" or New England, do not allow the validity of
" diſſenting ordinations; and that no diſſenting
" teacher will be ſuffered to officiate in the eſta-
" bliſhed church without being re-ordained. We
" alſo believe that diſſenting teachers have no
" right to adminiſter the ſacraments, and that
" they act repugnant to ſcripture in ſo doing, &c."

That there is an act of parliament that directs reordination before non-epiſcopal paſtors can be admitted to officiate in the eſtabliſhed church, I grant. But that it is a principle to be found in the offices

or

or articles of the church, that non-epiſcopal ordinations are invalid, and that none but paſtors epiſcopally ordained have a right to adminiſter the ſacraments in the church of Chriſt, I deny. That there may have been a party, and that there are ſtill ſome in this enlightened age, that have embraced this narrow, dividing, uncharitable ſentiment, ſo injurious to all proteſtants non-epiſcopal at home and abroad,—this letter of F. A.'s, and thoſe of ſome other late writers, ſhew very plainly. But this was not the ſentiment of the firſt reformers—does not make part of the offices or articles of the church, and has been and is diſclaimed by many reſpectable perſons of that communion, both among the dead and the living——What this writer muſt mean by epiſcopal paſtors acting repugnant to ſcripture by taking on them to adminiſter the ſacraments, muſt be, I preſume, *his ſenſe* of ſcripture—not theirs, for they declare after the moſt diligent ſearch they can find, there is no diſtinction between a Biſhop and a Preſbyter.—The epiſcopal members themſelves are not agreed whether Biſhops and Preſbyters differ in order or degree—The firſt reformers of this church did not claim as of a different order *jure divino*—did not unchurch thoſe who were not epiſcopally ordained—and therefore it is a melancholy reflection ſuch a monopolizing, uncharitable ſentiment ſhould be ſo warmly eſpouſed by any now. Archbiſhop Laud, that great enemy to liberty in the laſt age, was the grand patron of this principle—and acts of uniformity have ſince prevented the operation of a better, and from this ſource it is come down to and continues among us. A. M.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Dec.* 31, 1768.

THE Italics at the end of your Chronicle of Dec. 22, do not pleaſe us here. Is it poſſible any one, with the title of *Engliſhman*, (as your correſpondent calls himſelf) can be for proſcribing religious ſubjects out of the London Chronicle? Does not a propoſal of this kind look like bridling the preſs? Is there not ſomething of an intolerant tendency in a complaint of this ſort? Had it been made in a country where the *index expurgatorius* is in faſhion, one would not have wondered. Are there more or better eſſays upon other ſubjects in any one news-paper that is publiſhed? Why then not eſſays on religious ſubjects among the reſt? Is this Pſeudo Engliſhman's taſte to be a ſtandard for every reader of your paper, and ſhould he prevail with you, would he not try his intereſts or his arguments upon others? You have not indeed told us by what motives he ſupports his ſolicitations; but whatever they are, they are motives of no value, motives which ſhould make no impreſſion upon you, becauſe they will make none upon a far greater number of your readers than go to compoſe his party. Go on then, Sir, to publiſh what is ſent you, and is fit to be publiſhed, on all ſubjects, with your uſual diſcretion and impartiality.

You

You have manifeſtly the lead at preſent, I wiſh you to keep it, and I am ſure your proſcribing religious ſubjects is not the way. I am one of your oldeſt cuſtomers, and of your oldeſt correſpondents. I have always had a predilection for your Chronicle, and ſo have a number of my friends in this place, whoſe ſenſe I am now ſpeaking as well as my own, and who join in recommending perſeverance to you at all adventures, with,

Mr. Printer,

Your conſtant reader,

Cambridge, *And humble ſervant,*

Dec. 24. CANUS ACADEMICUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Jan.* 19, 1769.

THERE was in this kingdom, within my memory, a venerable object, much reſpected by all wiſe and good men, called THE PROTESTANT INTEREST. This gracious figure was then contemplated as of the utmoſt importance to the peace and welfare, the dignity and ſtability of the Britiſh government. She was well received and ſtudiouſly attended to in the moſt auguſt aſſemblies, which, upon particular occaſions, have expreſſed their opinion that the weakening the *Proteſtant Intereſt*, was endangering the public peace and ſafety.

As this once valuable object was like all other ſublunary beings, ſubject to mortality, and as I had heard very little mention made of her of late years, my curioſity led me into an inquiry, what was become of her? and I was once upon the point of advertiſing for intelligence, ſuppoſing her burial, if that ſhould be the caſe, might be recorded in ſome pariſh regiſter. But I conſidered, that if, through age and infirmity, or through the deſertion of ſome of her old and powerful friends, ſhe ſhould be in a ſtate of poverty and obſcurity (as indeed I ſuſpected) I ſhould hardly be able to make any diſcoveries this way, as I had it not in my power to ſay, as is uſually done in ſuch caſes, that by her applying to ſuch or ſuch a place, "ſhe would hear of ſomething to her advantage."

I was therefore obliged to content myſelf with ſuch intelligence as I could pick up from particular perſons, ſuch eſpecially as I had known to have had connexions with her, in the days of her proſperity.

The firſt I applied to could give no other account than that "he ſuppoſed they to whom ſhe "had heretofore been ſo ſerviceable, could now "do very well without her; that the catholics, of "whom ſhe and her party had formed jealouſies "and prejudices, were of late found to be good "ſort of people, very fit to be countenanced and "truſted, and as proper inſtruments to be em-"ployed in effecting the peace and ſtability of go-"vernment, as any others; that they had tried "the experiment, by ſending a dignified eccle-"ſiaſtical character to a remote country, and if "that ſucceeded, more experiments might be ven-

"tured

" tured nearer home; that he ſuppoſed the party I
" meant, having been diſguſted on being in a
" great meaſure laid aſide, as of no farther uſe in
" civil policy, had withdrawn from that depart-
" ment, but he thought I might be ſure to find her
" ſomewhere in the church."

Thither then I betook myſelf, and meeting with a gentleman of the order very likely to be in the ſecret, I requeſted of him to know where this object of my inquiry might be met with. After looking at me with ſome earneſtneſs, and, as I thought, aſtoniſhment, he ſaid, he remembered to have heard of ſuch a name, but would not own he had any acquaintance with her perſon; that he could not ſay ſhe had of late frequented the high places of the temple, nor did he think that they who did, were much mortified at her abſence. " Beſide,
" Sir, ſays he, we do not chuſe to be out of the
" faſhion, and I have reaſon to believe, that, as
" her *preciſeneſs* has diſguſted ſo many of the laity
" of rank, it may have had a ſimilar effect upon
" us. I have heard indeed, continued he, that ſome
" of our brethren of the lower order, have been
" ſimple enough to ſeek her out in her diſtreſs, to
" carry her home, and to give her handſome and
" affectionate entertainment, even at the expence
" of forfeiting their hopes of future emoluments.
" But among others, with whom ſhe was once on
" the moſt intimate terms, ſhe has found but cool
" and hungry quarters, on account of certain
" proſpects, in the proſecution of which they were
" ſenſible ſhe could do them no good. The laſt I
" heard of her was, that ſhe had attended lately
" at a certain chapel, where ſhe gave herſelf airs of

" being affronted at an altar-piece, which ſhe cal-
" led *popiſh*, had the aſſurance to exclaim, ' True
" ſons of old Jammy preaching againſt popery,
" and acting for it.' Your ſervant, Sir, I ſuppoſe
" you may hear more of her among the diſſenters."

And indeed among the diſſenters to whom I next reſorted, I found great numbers of her hearty and ſincere friends, who would have contributed all they could to maintain her according to her rank and merit, and to ſupport her eſtimation and dignity among their fellow-ſubjects. But when ſhe came to them, they ſaw her in ſo ragged a condition, ſo maimed and disfigured, ſo ſickly and infirm, and ſo marked and branded with a particular inſtrument, that it was impoſſible for them to put her in repair with all they were worth, much leſs to reſtore her to her former ſtrength and beauty. Nor, it ſeems, was ſhe univerſally pleaſed with all of this denomination. Among ſome of them ſhe found a hankering after organs and ceremonies, of different ſorts; and there were a few among them who thought it would not be right to take out *her* brandmarks, without doing as much for her old antagoniſt, popery; to avoid, as they ſaid, all imputation of partiality.

The generous creature however, refuſed this intercommunity of privileges with her mortal enemy, and retired in diſdain to the methodiſts, where, indeed, ſhe found numbers dreſſed up in the antique garb of thoſe venerable fathers and confeſſors, who firſt introduced her into this country. But finding it an indiſpenſable condition of the ſociety-covenant that all the members ſhould be ruffed and farthingaled in the ſame mode, ſhe found this ſyſtem too

too narrow for the compaſs of her benevolence, and withdrew from them, without notice where ſhe might be found, in caſe this people ſhould in a better mood agree to receive thoſe who reſembled the reformers of King Edward's and Queen Elizabeth's day rather in their charity of heart and ſimplicity of manners, than their garb or their expreſſion.

It was long ere I could here tidings of the place of her next retreat, till meeting with an honeſt Quaker upon Change, I put the queſtion to him, whether the *Proteſtant Intereſt* had taken refuge in the reſpectable body to which he belonged? His anſwer was to this effect. "Friends, I can aſſure "thee, are extremely well diſpoſed toward the "party thou ſeekeſt, but for as much as her abode "with us, would be the ſureſt way to have her aban-"doned by all her old friends of every other de-"nomination, we chuſe not, for her own ſake, to "ſhew our countenance of her *openly*. And as "her own ſpirit will not allow her to accept of "relief or entertainment *privately*, in a country "where ſhe has ſo many nominal friends and re-"lations, without an imputation of her having "done ſomething to be aſhamed of, ſhe departed "from us a good while ago, but whither I am not "exactly informed. It was rumoured this day, "that ſhe took a paſſage for New England, but "had intelligence that the lodgings and accom-"modations there intended for her, were taken up "by other kind of inmates; upon which, as the "ſaid report continueth, ſhe changed her purpoſe, "and embarked for the valleys of Piedmont, whi-"ther it ſeemeth her above-ſaid nominal relations,

" determine to ſend a contribution towards her " board and lodgings, in conſideration that in her " preſent ſtate of old age and infirmity, it is not " likely ſhe ſhould be able to earn her bread by " her own activity as heretofore, and much leſs " likely, that the poor Waldenſian Savoyards " ſhould have the means to ſupport her, how far " ſoever their love for her may exceed that of her " richer kindred." Here ended the worthy Quaker, and here, Mr. Printer, endeth your humble ſervant.

THRENODES.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Jan.* 19, 1769.

IF the papiſts can ſhew their principles concerning the Britiſh conſtitution civil and religious, not to be ſuch as they are repreſented, they would do well to employ another ſort of an advocate than your correſpondent Mr. W. who totally miſtakes the grounds on which they are charged with intolerance. The ingenious writer who ſtiled himſelf *Look out*, was too complaiſant to follow him into foreign countries for examples of their treachery and cruelty to proteſtants. He hath indeed driven W. to a diſtreſsful pinch, as appears by his ſaying that the revocation of the edict of Nantes by Lewis XIV. and the horrid and brutal perſecution of proteſtants which followed thereupon, is *nothing to the pur-*

purpoſe. Every one that reads the hiſtory of France ſees that Lewis was ſapping the foundations of this edict for the whole twenty years, in which this ſtrange mortal repreſents him as tolerating the proteſtants. If he ſhould aſk, what hindered him from revoking it ſooner? I anſwer, partly his political connexions with proteſtant powers out of his kingdoms, and partly his apprehenſions of irritating the proteſtants of his own dominions, before he had ſufficiently broken the ſtrong and reſpectable connexions the proteſtants of France had formed while the edict was obſerved. When he had brought his political matters to bear, he did not heſitate a moment to ſacrifice the poor proteſtants to the ſuggeſtions of the prieſts, who were perpetually alarming him with the proſpect of an hell for all his enormities, from which he had no way to eſcape, but by extirpating hereſy out of his dominions *totally* and *finally*.

This is ſomething indeed to us, as it ſhews the invariable genius of popiſh eccleſiaſtics, and the blind ſubmiſſion which every devotee they have, from the Beggar up to the King, muſt pay to their doctrine; in this light it ſhews us what we have to apprehend from the papiſts at home, with ſuch ſhoals of peddling prieſts about them. But we do not want this evidence We charge the papiſts of this country with holding the doctrine of intolerance, and of abſolute ſubmiſſion to the Pope as head of the church *irreſpectively* (for that is their ſcholaſtic term) to all other obligations whatſoever. This we know, and we know it, not by deductions from what has been, not from ſuſpicions of what may be, but from glaring proofs of

what is. We learn it from their *Apologiſts*, their *Free Examiners*, their *Biographers*, their *Eſſayiſts*, and *Reflecters*, and from the productions of their lurking ſcribblers in every corner of the kingdom, but particularly of this metropolis. We even know the men from whom we learn all this. We are no ſtrangers to their perſons, their haunts, or to their connections, any more than we are to their ſentiments. And if to ſuch men as theſe, ſo principled, and ſo authoriſed by the church, all the Roman catholics in the kingdom go to confeſſion, need the Britiſh proteſtant be told what muſt be their *penance* for acknowledging the title of George III. or for holding the pernicious doctrine that hereticks are to be tolerated? Before Mr W. therefore carries us to Hungary and Tranſilvania, let him, if he can, calm the apprehenſions of loyal proteſtants, ſubjects at home, by ſhewing that no ſuch books are written, or not written by popiſh prieſts, or not bought up by popiſh laymen. He may then ſet about illuſtrating the lenity of the houſe of Auſtria, which we are told in the very ſame Chronicle which exhibits his letter, is now, in conjunction with the Bourbonites, ſpiriting up the Turk to aſſiſt the popiſh confederates in Poland to cut the throats of all the Diſſidents in that kingdom. And we are told it, as it ſhould ſeem, upon no dubious authority.

A SINGLE PEEPER.

For the LONDON CHRONICLE.

Jan. 21, 1769.

A genuine letter from a NOBLE LORD *to a* R. R PRELATE.

My Lord, ******, *June* 15, 1754.

I WAS yeſterday informed that your Lordſhip had laid your commands upon Mr. ********, the Vicar of this pariſh, to repair to his living; your Lordſhip, it ſeems, being no longer diſpoſed to diſpenſe with his non-reſidence. The Vicar and his friends give out, that this order is occaſioned by a vote the Vicar gave at a late election contrary to your Lordſhip's judgment.

I do not pay the leaſt regard to this repreſentation, nor have I any ſuſpicion that your Lordſhip was determined in this matter by any other conſideration than a pious concern for the good of the pariſhioners. And on that account, I make myſelf ſure your Lordſhip will no longer inſiſt upon Mr. ********'s reſidence with us, after your Lordſhip is informed that it is likely to have a contrary effect.

In ſhort, My Lord, the pariſhioners of ******, deſire to ſee no more of their preſent Vicar than they uſually do, which is for about a fortnight or

three weeks annually in partridge time. They are a ſerious good ſort of people, and the diligence, ſobriety, good ſenſe, and humanity of their preſent Curate, are highly acceptable and edifying to them. This worthy man muſt of courſe be diſmiſſed if the Vicar comes to reſide, and the people think they ſhall be no gainers by the exchange.

We acknowledge, my Lord, that Mr. ******** has his accompliſhments. He is a polite Gentleman, plays a good fiddle, dances gracefully, knows whiſk perfectly, is no contemptible markſman at a partridge, or a woodcock, of an excellent taſte, and exquiſite judgment on the merit of claret and port, and by the ſtrength of his head, is able to carry off his full ſhare of either, always with decency, and not ſeldom with glory. But the misfortune is, that the poor people of his pariſh, have no opportunities of ſitting under his miniſtry, when and where he is diſplaying theſe admirable talents; and when it comes to their turn to profit by his paſtoral gifts, it is an univerſal complaint, that their attention cannot keep pace with his expedition, in reading the leſſons and the prayers, and that their capacities cannot fathom the depth of his diſſertations on the idea of deity, eternal relations, or the dignity of the church; which laſt point he always contrives to touch upon either in the exordium or peroration of his diſcourſe.

When the Vicar is with us, the Curate migrates to his maſter's other living, above fifty miles off, (tho' certified, by the bye, to be only thirty) and whatever occaſional duties are wanted in the interval, the pariſhioners are, for the moſt part, obliged

bliged to have recourſe to a neighbouring clergyman, as the Vicar's engagements are not to be broken by ſuch trifling avocations.

Some little time before your Lordſhip's promotion to the epiſcopal bench, a motion was made in our houſe for a bill to compel the incumbents of benefices yielding 150l. per ann. or upwards, clear of repriſals, to conſtant reſidence. The bench were in general againſt the motion, on account of the diſcouragement this would be to learning, (as the motion was in effect deſigned to exclude pluralities) and the hardſhip it would be on men of ſuperior parts, to be confined to the performance of the ordinary parochial duty, which might be diſcharged by Curates of much inferior qualifications; and to theſe were added an argument taken from the obligation there was upon the ſtate to protect the church in her rights and privileges.

I did not, I own, comprehend the force of this reaſoning, but however I ſtruck in with the party againſt the motion, upon a plainer and more intelligible argument of my own, taken from the inconvenience of confining numbers of the more opulent and faſhionable clergy, to their reſpective cures; with their intriguing, ambitious, ſecular, and ſenſual ſpirit about them. I thought then, and I continue ſtill to think, that they would be very bad examples to the people, and do more harm by their practice, than they would do good by their inſtructions. I expreſſed my opinion, that where a man's conſcience would not diſpoſe him to take the care of his pariſh perſonally upon himſelf, he muſt have ſome very unclerical qualities, which it could not be expedient for his people to imitate.

imitate. I have known reſident clerks, and ſo perhaps has your Lordſhip, who have greatly contributed to corrupt their pariſhioners, by their unedifying converſation, and the influence their ſuperior fortune gave them. It is true, a Curate may be vicious and diſorderly as well as a Rector or Vicar; but their bad example ſeldom does any very extenſive miſchief. Their ſcanty ſtipend and ſubordination to their principles, prevents their riſing to any great degree of eſtimation, except what they purchaſe by a virtuous conduct, and an attention to their duty; and a poor ſcoundrel may always lay his account with being contemptible. But this is a ſubject which, being capable of ſo clear illuſtration from facts, there is no occaſion to enlarge upon. And I have now only to requeſt your Lordſhip to conſider me as the amanuenſis of my well-meaning neighbours, ſave only, that being intereſted in the ſucceſs of their application as a pariſhioner, I moſt heartily join in their requeſt; and am,

My Lord,

Your Lordſhip's moſt obedient ſervant,

* * * * * * * * * * *.

To

To the PRINTER.

Jan. 28, 1769.

THE controverſy betwixt the author of Pietas Oxonienſis and of Goliah ſlain, and Dr. Nowell, occaſioned by the expulſion of the ſix ſtudents from the univerſity of Oxford, is diverting and inſtructive in a high degree. The power of prejudice over men otherwiſe caſt in the ſame mould, was never more ſtrongly exhibited. For both the combatants are profeſſed high-churchmen, viz. putting the articles and liturgy of the church on a level with the holy ſcriptures: and yet the former, having embraced the predeſtinarian opinions, paints the perſecuting Laud in his true colours, and ſpares in his anger neither Hammond nor Buli, and gives no ſort of quarter to Tillotſon, who, to his Arminianiſm, in which he agreed with theſe other fathers of the church, unfortunately joined a diſlike of St. Athanaſius's creed. Dr. N——, on the other hand, equally intolerant and idolizing the church ſtill more, if poſſible, does yet without a bluſh, in the face of the very articles that ſpeak the contrary, deny the doctrine of predeſtination to be the doctrine of the church of England. It is curious to ſee his method of proof; which is briefly this. In articles ix. x. xvii. of the church, the freedom of the human

man will is denied, and the doctrine of predeſtination aſſerted in terms as formal and expreſs as can poſſibly be deviſed. But then, there are ſeveral expreſſions in the liturgy at large, in the writings of its firſt compilers, and of ſome of the firſt eminent doctors of the church, which are capable of a contrary ſenſe. And therefore, Dr. Nowell concludes, from this ſeeming contrariety, that the doctrine of predeſtination cannot be reckoned a doctrine of our church.

It ſtruck me, as I peruſed his book, that by the ſame method of argumentation, it may be proved that the doctrine of the Trinity alſo is not the doctrine of the church. Behold it here drawn out in form. In the i. ii. and v. articles, this doctrine is laid down in direct words, the Son very and eternal God, the Holy Ghoſt very and eternal God, as well as the Father. But then the general phraſe of the liturgy, and the prayers in it, are chiefly unitarian, viz. addreſſed to the one God through Chriſt. And, which is alſo very remarkable, the apoſtle's creed, in the church miniſtration of baptiſm for thoſe of riper years, is held ſufficient for them to expreſs their faith in, and to entitle them to eternal ſalvation. And this creed ſtiles the Father only God. Therefore, after Dr. Nowell's method, we muſt infer that the doctrine of the Trinity is not the doctrine of the church. The better inference would be, and the natural wiſh of all ſincere chriſtians, that the vith article, which virtually includes all the reſt, were the only one required to be ſubſcribed, or that the doctrines, required to be aſſented to, were propoſed in the expreſs and only infallible words of the holy ſpirit.

This

This would put an end to theſe idle controverſies, about articles of men's device, and prevent that ſhameful ſhuffling, and prevarication with their conſciences and ſubſcriptions to which the moſt orthodox are often reduced as well as others. The famous Waterland, who ſo much accuſed others of tampering with their conſciences, could never clear up his own Arminian ſubſcription of predeſtinarian articles. And his follower and adorer, the author of the three letters on the Confeſſional, not unconſcious of the inſincerity of his own ſubſcription, endeavours to ſcreen himſelf by traducing the writer of that noble work as contravening his ſubſcriptions, made with the church. And Dr. Nowell, in a very unmanly way, continues the ſame inſult, whilſt he notoriouſly ſtands in need of many grains of allowance, and apes the Anti-confeſſional Doctor, and gleans his ſcraps after him in a humble way, but which yet are far from proving the point he wiſhes, i. e. predeſtination not to be the doctrine of the church of England.

CHILLINGWORTH.

To Mr. J. WILKIE,

In St. Paul's Church-Yard.

SIR, *March* 25, 1769.

CAN you, Mr. Wilkie, who dwell under the awful ſhade of our grand metropolitan church? Can you with unconcern, behold, even in

in idea, the ſacred eſtabliſhment that raiſed it levelled with the duſt? Or when you add your ſquirts and popguns to the rage of the winds and waves that beat againſt this manſion founded upon a rock, do you in ſecret ſmile at its utter diſregard and inſenſibility of their impotent fury? Indeed you have reaſon. But you muſt laugh outright at the ſacred and rueful countenances of the many ragged hod-carriers, or attendants on poor journeymen bricklayers, who are running about in confuſion, and thinking to add ſolidity to the edifice, by diſfiguring its fair front with the dirty dabs of untempered mortar we ſee daily ſtuck up in the public papers.

Serioufly, if thoſe who are for admitting no eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment whatſoever, though founded upon the moſt free, rational, and comprehenſive plan, may be ſuppoſed not to have the intereſts of chriſtianity, or indeed of any religion, much at heart; they as evidently betray too ſlight an eſteem of our church eſtabliſhment in particular, who dread its crumbling to pieces, upon the firſt attempt that is made to ſurvey, repair, or ſtrengthen its weak, defective, or ill-conſtructed parts. Whatever we may apprehend to be the fate of the eſtabliſhment, if it be ſuffered to continue much longer in its preſent neglected ſtate, it is believed that all religion under it is daily loſing ground, and that the only reſpectable advocates for chriſtianity now remaining amongſt us, all unite in paſſionately wiſhing for a fair and impartial review of our religious forms.

When I ſee the doughty confeſſionaliſt preparing to purge the eccleſiaſtical floor, and with brandiſhed

diſhed iron flail threatening to daſh both the good grain and the chaff into duſt, then with whirlwind fan to whiſk them both away together into the highways and commons, I feel no other emotion at the ſight than concern that the ſtrength of that ſinewy arm is not more diſcreetly uſed, in ſeparating only the good grain from the chaff. From the execution of the wild miſchief, he and his aſſociates only ſeem to threaten, I truſt, the wiſdom of the legiſlature will for ever ſecure us. What I much more dread is the blundering officiouſneſs of their puny antagoniſts, who obſtinately perſiſt the more in preſerving, with equal care, the ſmutty and ſound corn together. That theſe may poſſibly mean well I will not diſpute. The defect may be in their faculty of diſcernment. Againſt either of theſe, however, I apprehend, all ſober argument has little chance of availing much. The neutrals, a third and by far the moſt numerous tribe, are below contempt. There is a fourth party, a ſmall, but upon the leaſt encouragement, a growing and vigorous one, upon which I ſtill fix my diſtant hopes, who forming a more favourable opinion of the preſent ſpirit and temper of the church of England, both uſe themſelves, and publicly contend for a latitude of ſubſcription, without which it is not eaſy to conceive how any man of underſtanding and conſcience can poſſibly ſubſcribe at all. The only arguments I have ſeen oppoſed to this claim are, firſt, that it is ſet up merely to ſuperſede the apparent neceſſity of a reformation. On the contrary, its evident tendency is a reformation in ſome degree: And by allowing the members of the church freely and ſecurely to ſpeak their minds upon

upon the ſubject of a farther progreſs in this good work, it is indeed the only probable means to effectuate it. Again the matter of fact is diſputed, by the moſt rigid diſſenters eſpecially. It is denied that the preſent ſpirit of the church of England is at all inclined to favour a latitude. I ſhall in a future letter (if you are diſpoſed to checquer your paper with a diſquiſition of that ſort) demonſtrate its ſuperior moderation to every other eccleſiaſtical conſtitution upon earth. In the mean time we may ſafely truſt * an hiſtorian, who was never ſuſpected of partiality againſt our ſectaries, "that "both the preſbyterians and independents have carried the principle of rigour in the point of conſcience much higher, and acted more implacably "upon it than ever the church of England has "done in her angrieſt fits." Be that as it may, what was formerly the ſenſe of the church is not now the queſtion. The preſent temper of the leading members of it is beſt determined by the approbation or cenſure with which they receive the profeſſed advocates for moderation and latitude. To this point it becomes thoſe only to ſpeak, who have the honour to be admitted to an acquaintance with the ſentiments of our right reverend ſpiritual rulers. If any ſuch will be pleaſed to give his public teſtimony to what all ſincere and intelligent friends of the church muſt wiſh to be the truth, he will confer the higheſt obligation upon them all, particularly upon one, who hopes to approve himſelf a free and rational conformiſt, ſubſcribing himſelf by a name he has thought proper to aſſume in a late publication.

TYRO-PHILELEUTHERUS.

To

* Burnet.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *April* 6, 1769.

RUMMAGING the other day, among ſome lumber in a Bookſeller's warehouſe, I accidentally met with an old folio pamphlet with the following title:

"A *Collection* of the ADDRESSES which have "been preſented to the QUEEN ſince the Impeach-"ment of the Reverend Dr. HENRY SACHEVE-"RELL; whereby it moſt evidently appears, that "the ſenſe of the Kingdom, whether *Nobility*, "*Clergy*, *Gentry*, *or Commonalty*, is *expreſs* for the "Doctrine of PASSIVE-OBEDIENCE and NON-RE-"SISTANCE, and for Her Majeſty's HEREDITARY "TITLE to the Throne of Her Anceſtors. *Which* "*may ſerve as an* Appendix *to the Doctor's* Tryal. "LONDON, Printed: and ſold by *John Morphew* "near Stationers Hall. 1710."

As I often make the maſter of the ſhop a little money, he ſometimes obliges me with an old worm-eaten thing *gratis*, and I was in hopes of carrying off this curious affair, either as a preſent, or for a trifle, and was ſurpriſed to hear him exclaim, the moment I ſhewed it to him, "Odſo! "the very thing I wanted, and have been ſeeking "this three weeks!—a *ſhilling*, Sir!—Dear Sir,

"I

" I would not part with it for *five guineas*.—
" Twenty people have been inquiring for it, and
" could I have found it in time, I would have run
" the hazard of reprinting it, as a book of *prece-*
" *dents*.—A thing of that ſort is very much wanted
" at this juncture—The *ſtyle*, the *ſpirit*, the *zeal*,
" the—the—the *figuration* of our modern addreſſes,
" are nothing, Sir, upon my word, nothing, in
" compariſon with thoſe of our anceſtors, abſo-
" lutely nothing—and all for want of a collection
" of *precedents*.—*Reprint* it! why not? I don't
" know that it will even yet be out of time.—Ex-
" cuſe me, Sir, I cannot part with it on any ac-
" count."

When the rapture was over, and matters grew cool, I prevailed for leave to take it home for the evening, upon a promiſe however to return it in the morning time enough for its going to the preſs, by which means I had the opportunity of looking a little into the contents, of which, Mr. Printer, I now ſend you an account, with a few obvious remarks, ſuggeſted by the plain caſe, without any intention to promote the views, or flatter the pretenſions of any party whatever.

Theſe addreſſes are in number 79; all of which (*twelve* excepted) are indeed properly enough characteriſed in the title-page, breathing out *paſſive-obedience* and *non reſiſtance*, with a flaming zeal, and vilifying the principles of the revolution, with the ſcandalous appellations of *rebellious*, *ſeditious*, *republican*, *odious*, *abominable*, &c. &c.

I do not however believe that they could juſtly be ſaid to contain *the ſenſe of the kingdom*, as her Majeſty I dare ſay would have found, had that miniſtry

niſtry, for the introduction of which they were calculated, come a little nearer the accompliſhment of the project, to which her Majeſty's death put an end.

The *twelve* addreſſes, I have excepted, ran in a different ſtrain; they congratulated her Majeſty on the ſucceſs of her arms, commended her whig miniſters, profeſſed their adherence to the principles of the revolution, their reſolution to promote the ends of it, particularly the proteſtant ſucceſſion; and their deteſtation of the principles of *Sacheverell* and his party, and of the factious riotings on his behalf.

Theſe addreſſes came from the county of *Berks*, the city of *Coventry*, the city of *Gloceſter*, the lieutenancy of *London*, the county of *Middleſex*, the juſtices of *Northamptonſhire*, the deputy lieutenants and militia officers of *Norwich*, the county of *Pembroke*, the county of *Southampton*, the juſtices of *Weſtminſter*, the juſtices of *Wiltſhire*, and the county of *Worceſter*.

Though theſe bore ſo ſmall a proportion to the reſt, as of 12 to 67, yet I make no doubt but they ſpoke the ſenſe of thoſe counties, cities, and bodies of men who were *ſilent* on the occaſion, among which were the univerſity of *Cambridge*, the eaſt and north ridings of the county of *York*, and many more, even to double the number of 67, which might be ſaid much rather to contain the ſenſe of the kingdom, than thoſe places from which the addreſſes were ſent, as plainly appeared indeed by the addreſs of the univerſity of *Cambridge*, and the counter addreſſes from *Nottingham*, *Here-*

Hereford, &c. &c. upon the acceſſion of King *George* I.

Be it remembered, however, that theſe *warm* addreſſes to the Queen, had their effect in procuring a new miniſtry, and a parliament too ready to ſupport a project, which no honeſt Engliſhman, who is a friend to his King and his country, can look back upon without horror. And the number and noiſe of theſe addreſſes undoubtedly ſtunned, and intimidated numbers of well affected ſubjects, who thought it more adviſeable to give way for the preſent, than to attempt a fruitleſs oppoſition.

Theſe things happened to our forefathers for our admonition. When this humour of addreſſing is ſet on foot in mere compliment to miniſters of ſtate, we ſhould be attentive to two points, before we engage in it. 1. That they who promote addreſſes do not always *mean* what they *ſay*; and, certain conditions apart, do not intend to abide by what for the preſent they really *do* mean. Few of the moſt zealous of ſuch addreſſers have ever been tried, without being convicted of having impoſed both upon the ſovereign and their own partizans. 2. That parties are not in fact ſo ſtrong as they often appear to be, in the multitude and uniformity of the addreſſes in which they ſeem to agree. Numbers are compelled into the ſervice, others engage in it without looking forwards to conſequences, who, when the curtain draws up, deteſt the ſcene it diſcloſes, and revolt, without more ado, to their quondam opponents. The firſt of theſe obſervations Queen *Anne* found to be true, when it was too late to remedy the evil. The latter was experienced by thoſe who ſaw, in the year

fifteen,

fifteen, in what the loyalty of *Oxford* and *Bath*, in particular, ended. History informs us, that this hath always been the event, ſooner or later, of addreſſing in favour of unconſtitutional men, meaſures, or principles. Public liberty, on Britiſh ground, is the moſt impudent thing in nature. It is neither to be laughed, ſtared, menaced, or addreſſed out of countenance. Who would have imagined it could have ſtood its ground againſt 67 addreſſes? Two of which, one would have thought, were enough to ſilence her for ever, I mean, one from the *metropolis*, the other from a famous *univerſity*. But all would not do, and the wiſdom and good ſenſe of the ſolitary *dozen* in her favour, was at length juſtified even by her very enemies.

I am,

SIR, *&c.*

OEDIPUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *April* 18, 1769.

AS a friend to chriſtian liberty and the proteſtant intereſt, I have ever beheld with pleaſure any judicious attempt to reduce our public religion nearer to the primitive model of the goſpel. We live in an enlightened age and a land of freedom; and nothing can be more deſirable to thoſe who have a ſerious concern for the beſt in-

 tereſts

tereſts of this country, than that our clergy ſhould not be required to ſubſcribe to articles of faith, which they do not believe, or to join with the laity in the repetition of creeds which none underſtand, and forms of worſhip, which, in many points, few of any reflection can approve. The author of the Confeſſional hath entered largely into this ſubject. I admire the ſolid reaſoning, the liberal ſpirit, the pious, catholic principles of that juſtly celebrated work. It is no wonder that a treatiſe of this nature ſhould excite the indignation of bigots, averſe to all reformation, who, although not infallible, are always in the right. But, that the friends of religious liberty ſhould conceive any prejudice againſt one who has ſo eminently diſtinguiſhed himſelf in their cauſe, is ſurprizing and unaccountable. If your correſpondent, *Tyro-Phileleutherus*, be really in earneſt in his deſire of reformation, and hath read the Confeſſional with due attention, he will find upon reflection, that he hath carried his cenſures of that book farther than either juſtice or prudence would allow. For my part, I can ſee no imaginable ground for the ſurmiſe, that the author is one of "thoſe who are for admitting no eccleſiaſtical eſta-"bliſhment whatſoever, though founded upon the "moſt free, rational, and comprehenſive plan." On the contrary, he pleads for an eſtabliſhment of this nature; the very deſign of his book is to propoſe ſuch an eſtabliſhment; and for this purpoſe, the plan which he offers for the ſecurity of the church, inſtead of the preſent ſubſcription, is as free, rational, and comprehenſive, as *Tyro-Phileleutherus*, or any one, can deſire.

A

A ſtring of metaphors ingeniouſly put together may perhaps afford as much pleaſure to ſome readers as to the compoſer. But, in theſe ſubjects, we ſhould look for ſtrength of argument, more than rhetorical flouriſhes of expreſſion. Truth is our object, not amuſement. The "brandiſhed "iron flail, and whirlwind fan," are aſſuredly ſtriking figures of ſpeech; but, with what propriety they are applied to the "ſinewy arm of the "Confeſſionaliſt, to daſh the good grain and the "chaff, and whiſk them both away into highways "and commons," I am yet to learn. In my opinion, nothing could be more improper or unjuſt. His zeal for religion is equalled by his judgment; he diſtinguiſhes as well as others, between the good grain and the chaff; and I am afraid he values the one, and deſpiſes the other, a little more than ſome people like. But, have patience, and the whole ſecret will come out. It ſeems, *Tyro-Phileleutherus* is an advocate for a "latitude of ſub-"ſcription, without which, (he ſays) it is not "eaſy to conceive how any man of underſtanding "and conſcience, can poſſibly ſubſcribe at all." Now it happens, that the futility of this latitudinarian ſcheme hath been fully expoſed by the author of the Confeſſional, who hath proved, that a ſubſcription to articles of belief in any other ſenſe than that of the compilers, ſo far as it can be known by information, and the plain literal meaning of words, amounts to no ſubſcription at all, and gives no ſecurity to the church, that the doctrine of thoſe articles is believed, or ſhall be preached by the ſubſcriber. Indeed the caſe is evident. For, if I am allowed to *abound in my*

own ſenſe of any confeſſion of faith, and am not required to receive it any farther than I think it agreeable to ſcripture, where is the difference, whether I ſet my hand to the thirty-nine articles, the creed of Pope Pius, or the koran of Mahomet? If ſubſcription to any human formulas can be vindicated, it is plain that a ſubſcription with reſervations of this kind defeats the very end for which it is impoſed. In this light, I cannot but highly approve of the ſenſible remark of the author of *Pietas Oxonienſis*, who obſerves to his antagoniſt, Dr. Nowell, that he and the letter-writer to the Confeſſionaliſt, have made a ſtrange jumble of ſubſcription and the King's declaration prefixed to the articles; which, conſiſtently with their ſcheme, ought to have been ſtyled, A declaration for *reconciling* diverſities of opinion, not for *preventing* them. But ſeriouſly, Sir, ſubſcription is a ſolemn affair; and it behoves thoſe who are concerned to conſider, impartially, how far the evaſions, which make them eaſy at preſent, are compatible with the integrity and ſimplicity of a chriſtian ſpirit, and will bear the trial of the great day, when the ſecrets of all hearts ſhall be made manifeſt. I do not mean to offend the Gentleman, whoſe letter to you, Mr. Printer, hath occaſioned theſe remarks. I ſincerely wiſh him well. I applaud his zeal for reformation, and I join with him in "paſſionately "wiſhing for a fair and impartial review of our "religious forms." But let not the friends of liberty weaken the hands of one another. Rather let them unite heart and hand in their addreſſes to our rulers for a review; and to their united endeavours,

deavours, let them add fervent prayers to the Father of Lights for direction and ſucceſs in their pious undertaking.

I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

A PROTESTANT.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *May* 6, 1769.

TO the candid remonſtrance inſerted in your Chronicle of April 18, and ſigned a proteſtant, a plain and ſerious anſwer is due. The ſtriking figures of ſpeech in the letter inſerted March 25, and ſubſcribed *Tyro-Phileleutherus*, at which offence is taken, might perhaps as well have been let alone, as they have occaſioned a man of ſenſe to miſtake my meaning; which yet upon a review of the whole tenour of my letter may appear to him obvious enough. As to the brandiſhed iron flail, and whirlwind fan, with which I deſcribe the author of the confeſſional as preparing to purge the eccleſiaſtical floor, and threatening, or, as I add, only ſeeming to threaten ſuch undiſtinguiſhing execution, I never meant to inſinuate the leaſt ſurmiſe of their being levelled at religion, as your correſpondent unluckily miſun-

derſtands me. The danger that very able and reſpectable writer has been thought to denounce is againſt our religious eſtabliſhment. He has been often, (moſt abſurdly, as I think) accuſed of joining in the avowed deſign of its open adverſaries, utterly to overthrow it. His zeal to reduce it nearer to the primitive ſtandard I admire, and moſt cordially approve. What I ſincerely grieve at, when expreſſed without a figure, his more implicit admirer may probably ſee cauſe to regret as well as I, that the great abilities he has ſo eminently diſplayed have not been more diſcreetly employed in a decent and diſpaſſionate application for redreſs of particular grievances, ariſing from certain circumſtances of an eſtabliſhment, in other reſpects, perfectly unexceptionable, as well as for a prudent removal of every reſtraint it impoſes upon chriſtian liberty. At the ſame time, inſtead of oblique hints of a ſtrong diſlike of the whole conſtitution, inſtead of the many diſparaging ſtrictures profuſely ſcattered throughout his work, upon the faireſt characters that ever adorned this church, I could wiſh that he had paid the due tribute of praiſe to its fundamental principles; and that he had vindicated, or acknowledged at leaſt, the ſuperior excellency that determines him ſtill to adhere to an eſtabliſhment, which might then have cauſe to glory in his continuing a moſt uſeful, as well as dignified member of it.

The gentleman has indeed miſtaken the grounds of the cenſure I have with real concern been induced to paſs upon a writer who commands my ſincere eſteem. Had he condeſcended to caſt an eye upon the arguments produced in favour of a latitude, in

my

my addreſs to the rational advocates of the church of England, lately publiſhed, he would have ſeen them founded upon a moſt unhappy neceſſity, which I deplore as well as he, without the ſmalleſt hope of a ſpeedy relief. He would have found it difficult to imagine that the government, civil or eccleſiaſtical, can actually now inſiſt upon a rigorous ſubmiſſion to certain conditions, evidently proved to be contradictory to each other. He would perhaps have been convinced that ſubſcription to our articles, in the plain ſenſe of the compilers, is in truth a ſubſcription to nothing at all, until it be found poſſible to fix that one, plain ſenſe, upon them, a taſk too arduous for any mortal brain. To caſt, for inſtance, the bottomleſs abyſs of darkneſs, *nullius res coloris*, in the 9th, 10th, and 17th articles, into one clear point of view, is a fit exerciſe only to rack the inventions of the academics of Pandæmonium.

When the ſpirited writer, whom we both regard with reverence, contends for extreme rigour in ſuch a caſe, or which is the ſame thing, when he denies the property of the latitude I claim in the interpretation of ſtatutes, which he declares to be iniquitous, yet moſt unlikely to be repealed, can the imputation of weakening the hands of the friends of liberty be juſtly removed from him, and caſt upon

TYRO-PHILELEUTHERUS:

ST. JAMES'S CHRONICLE, *May* 9, 1769.

To the PRINTER.

SIR,

I FIND in one of the morning papers a report, that "A celebrated priſoner* has had ſome very "advantageous propoſals made him by the higher "powers, on condition he once more becomes a "voluntary exile." I do not think this at all improbable. What can be more natural than that an expedient of this kind ſhould occur, as a political manæuvre, to thoſe who have found it ſo very ſucceſsful, in ridding themſelves of *celebrated* incumbrances in affairs of gallantry? When a man of exceptionable morals wants to become reſpectable, and to patch up a reputation not a little impaired by former *dereglemens*, nothing can be more diſagreeable, nothing more provoking, than the preſence of thoſe objects which are for ever putting the world in mind of his former connections, and ſerve to keep alive the memory of incidents, which he is not diſpoſed to acknowledge, and which it is impoſſible for him to diſavow with the remoteſt hope of being believed. Credible however as the report may be, I find politicians much divided in their ſentiments from whom the propoſal ſhould come. They who look at the ſurface of things only, think it obvious, that no man could

* Mr. *Wilkes*.

could propoſe the condition but one who had experimentally found the conſolation of it, in a ſimilar caſe, and at the ſame time had it in his power to make good the propoſal. Others think this impoſſible, as ſo many exhortations have appeared of late, to a certain great man, to ſtand firm, upon aſſurance that a vigorous perſeverance in ſpirited meaſures will, in the twinkling of an eye, annihilate the expiring faction which hath ſo long incommoded him. On another hand it is ſaid, that it can never come into any man's head, who, by entering into chaſter connections, is purchaſing a ſanctity of character, to penſion a *blaſphemer of his God*, and an *abuſer of his earthly ſovereign*, to a degree, that would make it worth his while to tranſport himſelf for life. There is likewiſe a point of prudence to be conſidered in ſuch matters. Two *voluntary* exiles of different ſexes, who have been each of them confidents in their turn, and in their ſeveral ways, to the ſame benefactor, may happen to fall in each other's way, and confer notes on their common ſituation, and the ſeveral cataſtrophes which brought each of them into it reſpectively. Female profeſſions of fidelity are not much to be relied upon, either in love or in politics: Nor is it to be ſuppoſed that he who is diſpoſed to *eſſay* upon the whole ſex at once, ſhould ſcruple to *eſſay* upon a particular female,* where his ſucceſs would anſwer ſo many different purpoſes. Should this be the caſe, the world might come to be amuſed with their revelations, at a much greater expence to the benefactor, than the amount of their ſeveral penſions.

* Miſs *I—ry—ns*.

However, for ſome particular reaſons, I have no doubt but the propoſal was made, and from thence am apt to believe that the firmneſs ſo much boaſted of, is not much to be relied upon; and that the Engliſhman who lately grounded his exhortation on the ſuppoſed evaneſcence of what he is pleaſed to call *the faction*, may, in no long time, fall into the diſtreſsful circumſtances of a caſhier'd ſubaltern, even without the comfort of his half-pay.

In the mean time, while the celebrated priſoner endures the unabated rigours of the law with the dignity and circumſpection for which he hath been hitherto diſtinguiſhed, the ridiculous virulence of his adverſaries in falling upon his private character, renders them to the laſt degree contemptible; his friends ſee with inward exultation, that theſe *firm* and *ſpotleſs* gentry are doing his buſineſs for him. For what remains, no one has the leaſt doubt of his patience and perſeverance, and from thence it requires no great depth of prophetic penetration to augurate the event.

His adverſaries, one would think, begin to ſee it too. The face of things alter ſo much and ſo faſt in his favour, that no adequate relief can be had in due time from the inſtructions of a principal at ſo great a diſtance.

The laſt expedient, it is whiſpered, was his own dear plan, and ſhould have been executed ſome months ago, but for the tardineſs of the Scotch Courier to whom the diſpatch was committed, which occaſioned the exhibition of the *Saw-mill** in a hurry, and before a more determined hero could be

* Mr. *D—ngl—y.*

be found; and when that defect was ſupplied, the expedient was wholly out of time, as probably will be the caſe of the next inſtruction, inapprehenſive as the inſolent inſtructor may be of the poſſibility that the cauſe ſhould be transferred from an individual to a moſt reſpectable body of Britiſh ſubjects, who feel as ſenſibly for the honour and happineſs of their beloved ſovereign, as for their own rights and liberties.

In this hour of diſtreſs, what poſſible refuge, but in a cartel of exchange of one voluntary exile for another?* A double advantage, no doubt, both with reſpect to the more commodious ſtation of the adviſer, and the diſreputable abdication of the man who ſeems hitherto to have been born to diſgrace every tool of falſe politics, by attempting to ſacrifice to his own ſelfiſh views the dignity of government, together with the moſt important intereſts of his free and generous fellow ſubjects. But Aſtræa ſeems diſpoſed to return, and

——— *reſoluta Catenis,*
Incedit Virgo, pretiumque et cauſa laboris.

I am,
SIR,
Yours, &c.
CAMILLUS.

* Lord *B*—— was then abroad.

LONDON CHRONICLE, *May* 27, 1769.

To the PRINTER.

SIR,

I HAVE great hope, from the candor and good ſenſe of your correſpondent *Tyro-Philelutherus*, that he will not be diſobliged by my differing from him in one or two particulars, exhibited in his letter of May the 6th.

He would have had the author of the Confeſſional to have paid the due tribute of praiſe to the fundamental principles of the church of England, and to have vindicated, or acknowledged at leaſt, the ſuperior excellency of her eſtabliſhment, by which your correſpondent ſuppoſes him to be determined to adhere to it.

Now I apprehend the caſe with the author of the Confeſſional ſtands thus. He ſeems to me to take the fundamental principle of the church of England to be, a ſtrict obligation to adhere to ſcripture grounds in every article of her eſtabliſhment. And to this principle he hath certainly given the due tribute of praiſe. If this is not the fundamental principle of the church of England, he is miſtaken.

If it is, it certainly implies a demand upon her for redreſs of every particular grievance ariſing from

from the circumſtances of her eſtabliſhment, which is inconſiſtent with the principle above-mentioned, as well as for (I will not call it a *prudent*, but) a *total* removal of *every* reſtraint which her eſtabliſhment impoſes upon chriſtian liberty.

But ſuppoſing the church of England to be thus reformed, in what reſpects would her eſtabliſhment be perfectly unexceptionable, in which the eſtabliſhment of the church of Scotland would *not* be perfectly unexceptionable, the like reformation in that church being preſuppoſed?

The author of the Confeſſional ſeems to me to have had no idea of any primitive ſtandard for the eſtabliſhment of a chriſtian church, but the chriſtian ſcriptures. In this he may be wrong, and I will not undertake to defend him; though, with reſpect to that principle, I have not yet ſeen him confuted. But *that* being his perſuaſion, he could not with any propriety, or any conſiſtency, have acknowledged, much leſs vindicated the *ſuperior excellency* of the *unſcriptural* parts of the eſtabliſhment of a church, whoſe fundamental principle is, an obligation to adhere to ſcripture grounds in every article of her eſtabliſhment.

I pretend not to have any knowledge of the author of the Confeſſional, or to know more of his ſentiments than he hath choſen to publiſh, and therefore cannot give any account of the reaſons which determine him to adhere to the church of England (if he is a member of that church, concerning which *Tyro-Phileleutherus* may know more than I do) but imagine, it may not be her *ſuperior excellency*, nor indeed can that be ſuppoſed to be the motive of thoſe who adhere to her, and yet acknow-

knowledge that there are certain conditions required by her, of ſome of her members, which have been evidently proved to be contradictory to each other.

I am, *&c.*

PHILELEUTHERUS, *jam Senior.*

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *June* 6, 1769.

THE profeſſed aim of *Tyro-Phileleutherus* being information, it became him to appear in the character of an humble queriſt. Far from being diſobliged, I am bound to return thanks to your more experienced correſpondent *Phileleutherus, jam ſenior*, for the remarks he has condeſcended to make upon my reply to the civil remonſtrance inſerted April 18, and ſubſcribed, *A Proteſtant*. He will in his turn, I hope, excuſe my appeal to his yet maturer ſecond thoughts, if I again preſume to ſtate the claim, which I ſtill think the church of England, though very highly indebted to the maſterly writer of the Confeſſional, may notwithſtanding make upon him to acknowledge the ſuperior excellency upon the whole of the eſtabliſhment, to which it is well known he continues to adhere.

Unpractiſed in the art of theological controverſy, I little ſuſpected that, when I expreſſed a wiſh that, to evidence the conſiſtency of his worthy character, he

he had actually done this, I could ever be repreſented as requiring him to vindicate the unſcriptural parts of that eſtabliſhment. With this attempt, therefore, to explain my meaning with better ſucceſs, I ſhall think it decent to drop the diſpute.

The ſuperior excellency of our eccleſiaſtical conſtitution to all others now exiſting, I truſt, a man of the ſtricteſt integrity may, with propriety and confidency, acknowledge, yet at the ſame time freely point out for reformation ſuch imperfections as its blindly-devoted vaſſals alone are abſurdly labouring to vindicate. This I have honeſtly and plainly declared to be my own caſe, (both in the courſe of this correſpondence, and in my late addreſs to the rational advocates of the church of England) being convinced of the impropriety of ſome of its impoſitions, yet at the ſame time really believing it to be incomparably nearer to perfection, and in moderation particularly far ſuperior to every other eccleſiaſtical conſtitution upon earth.

No one ever had ſuch opportunities of being intimately acquainted with the ſpirit of the leading members of the ſeveral proteſtant churches at home and abroad, as the right reverend prelate quoted in my letter, inſerted March 25. May I be allowed to add, that a ſlender acquaintance of the ſame ſort, having chanced to fall in my way, has confirmed, to my own ſatisfaction, the truth of the obſervation he made above half a century ago. I happen to know a little of the too ſenſible indications of an inquiſitorial ſpirit, in the proteſtant churches of Germany; of conſiderable remains of the old leaven in Holland, ready to ferment

ment upon occaſion into a ſecond ſynod of Dort; of the treatment of poor honeſt Rouſſeau at Geneva; and of the ſhocking proſecution of the truly venerable Herport at Berne, that vainly boaſts a greater ſhare of moderation than all other proteſtant eſtabliſhments. This laſt moſt barbarous exorbitancy of diſcipline, I am well aſſured, the milder governors of our church in general highly condemn.

I ſhall now take leave of my ſager and elder Monitor, *Phileleutherus, jam ſenior*, with this brief remark—that as the imputation of being determined to adhere to the church of England, by any leſs noble motive than a perſuaſion of its ſuperior excellency, would be exceedingly grating and offenſive to myſelf, ſo the apprehenſion of ſeeing that imputation fixed upon a powerful and diſtinguiſhed advocate for religious liberty would ſincerely be unpleaſing to

TYRO-PHILELEUTHERUS.

For the LONDON CHRONICLE.

June 8, 1769.

To the R. R. the Lord BISHOP *of* ALBANY, *elect.*

MY LORD,

UNacquainted, as I am, with your Lordſhip's preſent abode, I am under a neceſſity of addreſſing my congratulations on your Lordſhip's pro-

promotion to a new American dignity, in this rambling way.

Some people may be pleaſed to ſay, that I am under no *neceſſity* of complimenting your Lordſhip on this event at all, and therefore under none to apologize for the *manner*. But of this I take myſelf to be the beſt judge. For tho' nobody, not even your Lordſhip, will be under any neceſſity of reading this addreſs, it is of ſome conſequence to my *bene eſſe* to diſburthen my mind upon paper, a privilege without which many an honeſt man might be in danger of ſuffocation, for want of a proper vent for the various paſſions which occaſionally attack writers of all ſizes and complexions.

My preſent mental oppreſſion is an exuberance of joy, on contemplating this inſtance of the wiſdom and felicity of the preſent times, in accompliſhing a meaſure ſo hopeful in the proſpect towards compoſing the ſchiſmatical ſpirit, (ſchiſmatical in a *political* as well as an *eccleſiaſtical* ſenſe) of our miſguided or miſinformed coloniſts. What can be more promiſing for the purpoſe, than the introduction of a ſpiritual character among them, inveſted with indefeaſible powers of *binding* and *loſing*, recommended by the ſplendor and magnificence of outward enſigns, calculated to command attention and reſpect, and tending to rectify the miſtake of thoſe infatuated men, who have affirmed, that the excellence of the chriſtian religion is to be judged of by its *internal* characters only.

There can be no doubt but your Lordſhip will turn theſe circumſtances to the beſt account, which, under the countenance, and with the co-operation of

of military politeneſs, may be productive of the moſt happy effects.

But as there is no human felicity void of an alloy of inconvenience, there are ſome particulars in this affair which may deſerve your Lordſhip's regard, more eſpecially as I find they already employ the ſpeculations of a good number of people at home.

As your Lordſhip's perſon is yet kept incog. various are the conjectures concerning the mode of your Lordſhip's election.

The firſt, which moſt naturally occurs, is that of the *Congé d'Elire*. But as this in Old England preſuppoſes a *Dean and Chapter* to whom it ſhould be directed, a difficulty ariſes, how the want of ſuch a venerable body may be ſupplied? A number of miſſionaries indeed might ſoon be incorporated, and the cathedral at *Albany* fitted up for their reception; but as a *ſinecure* implies a ſtipend, it is, I find, a queſtion how the appointments for ſuch a dignified body may be raiſed. This, however, might poſſibly be got over by the care and induſtry of the Propagating Society.

It is indeed apprehended, that an apparatus of this ſort might give umbrage to the ſchiſmatical party, who, in remembrance of what their forefathers ſuffered, as they often pretend, from inſtitutions of this kind, may once more oppoſe themſelves to this new foundation, and carry it ſo far, as to create apprehenſions of a *religious* as well as a *political* war, in ſupport of what they are pleaſed to call their ſpiritual privileges.

But what evil is there which an *expedient*, timely diſcovered and happily applied, may not remedy?

It

It is ſaid in our public prints, that a good number of our factious coloniſts, in oppoſition to the governmental meaſures, might be taken off by being promoted to lucrative employments, and not only be rendered tame and paſſive, but even brought, by ſuch allurements, to aſſiſt in humbling the audacious and ſeditious ſpirit of their com-patriots. How far this experiment has been made, I am ignorant, or whether the Gentleman who propoſed the expedient had any precedents to quote in ſupport of his advice. But I muſt own it looks extremely promiſing *a priori*, and as the influence of dignity and emolument upon human nature is nearly the ſame in all claſſes of mankind, ſuppoſe the immediate exaltation of our orthodox miniſters were to be poſtponed, and the vacant *Albanian* ſtalls filled with converts from the preſbyterian and congregational clergy upon the ſpot, whoſe conformity might be a leading hint to the remainder to follow them in due time, and in the mean ſeaſon, a check upon thoſe who might be diſpoſed to give diſturbance to the new eſtabliſhment.

It hath indeed been ſaid, that it is by no means a clear caſe how far the men of weight among them might be prevailed with to conform upon conſiderations of this kind. But of this I ſhould make very light, in full confidence of a maxim much in uſe, and of tried efficacy with the late E—l of B——th; IF ONE WILL NOT, ANOTHER WILL.

There are others however I find, who, conſidering how tender and indulgent we have been of late to the prejudices of our coloniſts, have taken it for granted, that your Lordſhip's election hath been

been made without having recourſe to canonical formalities, which might at the firſt, give offence to the American laity, who are apt to keep a jealous look-out upon the aſpiring genius of technical eccleſiaſtics, ſuch eſpecially as are tenacious of old ordinals and pontificals; and theſe are of opinion, that your Lordſhip's election hath been managed by way of *conclave* (a method which would naturally occur at this period) and of which nobody would be aware, till the appointment ſhould be announced in our public prints.

But however the affair is, it ſeems, ſome way or other, got over, and the next ſtep to be taken is *conſecration;* and here indeed, my Lord, my fears are for your Lordſhip's perſon. The grand argument for your Lordſhip's eſtabliſhment has been, the fear of having the miſſionaries, ſent from this ſide the water, ſhipwrecked in their paſſage. The world, it is true, hath not been appriſed, why a clerk ſhould be in a greater danger of a tumble overboard than a layman. However, this being preſuppoſed, a Biſhop muſt, in proportion to the *weight* of his character, be more liable to drown, than a ſimple curate. If your Lordſhip reſides in Old England, this hazard muſt be run of courſe, before your Lordſhip can be enthroned; and muſt be doubled if your Lordſhip is yet on the American continent, as a conſecration by proxy is impracticable, or at leaſt would be incumbered with certain theological ſcruples, which might embarraſs his Majeſty's profeſſors in both univerſities to ſolve.

I can indeed only think of one expedient. The doctrine of the church of England is, that no fault

ſault can be found with the Romiſh ordinations, nor, upon the ſame principles, with Romiſh conſecrations. If therefore your Lordſhip's reſidence, as is generally ſuppoſed, is already in the country where the function is to be exerciſed, your Lordſhip might, with running very little hazard, be accommodated by my Lord of Quebec with every equipment that may be wanted for the purpoſes of your appointment; or poſſibly his Lordſhip might be prevailed with, for a valuable conſideration, to make a trip to Albany, and confer the character in your own cathedral; his Lordſhip's perſon and utenſils being firſt inſured, out and in, by half a dozen ſubſtantial under-writers of the proteſtant faith.

Our American brethren will be the rather made ſenſible of the propriety and wiſdom of this caution, when they recollect, what a narrow eſcape one of their worthy governors had in croſſing the Atlantic the firſt time he came among them. They were then ſtrangers to his virtues, and looked upon his deliverance as not worth an eſpecial remark among the thouſands of inſtances of the ſame ſort which happen in the long paſſage between London and Boſton. But at this time I am told, they look back upon that auſpicious period with a kind of ſhuddering horror, in contemplation of the numberleſs evils to which the loſs of ſo diſintereſted, indefatigable, and benevolent a patriot might have expoſed them;—a patriot, whoſe tenderneſs for their proſperity and privileges, can only be equalled by his zeal to protect them from all kinds of oppreſſion, and to recommend them to the affection, eſteem, and kind offices of the rulers

in

in the mother country;—a patriot (to ſum up his magnanimous toils for their good, in one word) who never reſted till he had ſecured them from all violence and all apprehenſions, by a choſen guard of diſciplined Britons, imported from the mother country; who, beſides the ſafety they procure for their perſons and properties, have introduced a thouſand refinements in their manners and converſation, to which in their former ſimplicity, they were and muſt, but for this bleſſed incident, have continued utter ſtrangers.

I have no doubt but that, as your Lordſhip will enter upon your office with every recommendation with which this eminent and beloved perſonage can adorn you, your Lordſhip will not only ſilence every murmur, but annihilate every prejudice againſt your peculiar calling, and give as complete a *coup de grace* to the *ſchiſms*, as your reſpectable coadjutor in the civil department hath done to the *ſeditions* in thoſe unpoliſhed and untutored parts of the Britiſh empire.

I am, &c.

A Missionary Expectant.

For the LONDON CHRONICLE,

June 11, 1769.

A ſhort extract from the Rev. Dr. M———M'S SPEECH, *at preſenting to the Upper Houſe of Convocation, the Rev. Dr* THOMAS, *Dean of* Weſtminiſter, *to be Prolocutor of the Lower Houſe,* Feb. 3, 1769, *with a few remarks.*

THIS ſpeech, as uſual, is in Latin; and the Orator begins with the old *Sacheverel* cry, the danger of the church, and his ſecond paragraph runs thus——

—" But in theſe days, we have not only open ene-
" mies to contend with, but even thoſe of our own
" order, and who have ſubſcribed the churches ar-
" ticles. Some of theſe, the dupes of a blind en-
" thuſiaſm, have taken away the uſe of reaſon in
" religion, and thereby deſtroyed religion itſelf.
" Others cry out upon us for a further reforma-
" tion, but the true ſecret is, theſe gentlemen aim
" at a looſer kind of faith, and not to be tied down
" with articles and creeds. They complain of a
" papal yoke ſtill lying heavy on their ſhoulders.
" As if this was not the age, above all that ever
" have been, in which every one lives and thinks,
" at he liſts, without controul."

It

It is very eaſy to ſhelter abuſe and falſe logic, in an oration in a ſtrange language, that few read, and fewer underſtand. It is obvious, that two ſorts of men within the pale of the church, are here attacked: thoſe ſtiled methodiſts, and the favourers of the *Candid Diſquiſitions*, and *Confeſſional*? thoſe two bad books, that have given ſo much heart-ach and diſturbance to good churchmen.

As to the methodiſts, Meſſ. *Madan*, *Venn*, &c. I confeſs I cannot ſee wherein they are the church's enemies, unleſs it be on ſhaming their brethren, by their more abundant labours in preaching the goſpel.—But they are here accuſed of being againſt the uſe of reaſon in religion. Not more this, certainly, than their orthodox accuſers. For they alſo proſcribe the uſe of reaſon, where it is troubleſome to them, in certain doctrines and creeds, which they maintain to be above reaſon, and therefore not to be ſubject to it, nor enquired into at all. In which proſcription of rational enquiry the methodiſts harmonize perfectly with their brethren, ſome of them extending it perhaps to certain noſtrums of their own, but this not without the countenance of the church's homilies. Let this alſo be ſaid, to the honour of the methodiſts, that they have ſhewn a ſuperiority of reaſon, equal to the goodneſs of their cauſe, in their late defences of the calviniſtic ſenſe of the church articles, and of the cauſe of the ſtudents expelled the univerſity of Oxford, for praying, and expounding the ſcriptures, unſeaſonably and in private houſes, and for believing as the church believes.

I cannot ſay ſo much for the latter ſort of men here complained of, thoſe that plead for a farther amend-

amendment and reformation of the church's ritual and impoſed doctrines. Undoubtedly, they are its moſt dangerous enemies, and as ſure as truth ſhall prevail againſt error, their writings and arguments will in time ſubvert the church, if thereby be underſtood the complicated ſyſtem of our articles, canons, ſpiritual courts, &c.

But if we take the ſixth article of the thirty-nine, to be a rule and law for the reſt, as it ſeems to be, and ought to be; namely, that "Whatſoever is "not read in holy ſcripture, nor may be proved "thereby, is not to be required of any man, that "it ſhould be believed as an article of faith, or be "thought requiſite or neceſſary to ſalvation:"

If this be the ſenſe of our church, theſe candid Diſquiſitors and Confeſſionaliſts will be found her trueſt friends, as thoſe who ſeek to bring her back to the ſtandard of the word of God, and fix her on that immoveable rock.

—But it is objected to them, with a ſcoff as ill placed as the reaſoning is ſhallow, that becauſe they wiſh to be delivered from human impoſitions, they are therefore not inclined to believe what their Maker has clearly revealed. So, in the days of triumphant Popery, thoſe that did not care to ſwallow all their legends, were dubbed Atheiſts. And this is the cant of bigots in all times. But if a belief of holy ſcripture be not a ſufficient teſt of orthodoxy, it becomes thoſe who are not content with it, to wipe out the blot they thereby fix upon the word of God, as inſufficient and ineffectual without their explanations and additions.

At parting, theſe wiſhers for farther reformation are condemned for complaining of the burdens they are under, for this pleaſant reaſon, becauſe it is an age of liberty that we live in. As if one man being at his eaſe, hinder'd another's ſhoulders from being galled. Our Gentry, indeed, may be very eaſy about ſubſcriptions, becauſe they have nothing to do with them; though it is high time for them to look about them, if it be true, as a Profeſſor in one of our Univerſities avers, not only the cloth, but even women and children, ought to ſubſcribe.

But the cauſe of the Candid Diſquiſitions and Confeſſional, is above that ſlight and contempt with which theſe men affect to treat it. It boaſts, amongſt its foremoſt advocates, the honourable names of Biſhop Wilkins, Tillotſon, Burnet, Whiſton, Clarke, Hoadley, Hartley, and others, *olim nominandos*. The hero of our Doctor's little piece, who hath lately fallen aſleep, cannot indeed be numbered with theſe worthies; but he that had left the Diſſenters, in his riper age, and turned to the church, could never be ſuppoſed to eſpy any faults in her: and his poſthumous works are certainly a proof of his zeal for orthodoxy; of what elſe they are a proof, the world will judge.

VIRGULA CRITICA.

For the ST. JAMES'S CHRONICLE.*

June 24, 1769.

To JUNIUS.

UNMERCIFUL JUNIUS! Have you no regard for the honour of the firſt ſeminary of ſound learning and religious education in Europe? What dæmon ſuggeſted to you to bring our ſins to remembrance ſo cruelly and ſo unſeaſonably? Were you under any neceſſity to draw the portrait before the firſt of July? Did it not occur to you how many delicious compliments, poetical and proſaic, already upon the ſtocks, and upon the point of being fairly engroſſed, would be utterly and everlaſtingly marred by this your ill-natured contretemps? Could I deſcribe the many rueful countenances returning from our coffee-houſes on that fatal evening of May 31, when your letter firſt appeared among us, you, even you, Junius, I am perſuaded, would be touched with compaſſion. What added to the diſtreſs was, that before the next morning, there was written at the end of

* See Junius's Letters, Woodfall's edition, 1772, vol. i. p. 75, letter xii.

N. B. The writer of this letter being betrayed, found it neceſſary to retire from the univerſity, as the diſcovery put a final period to his expectations there.

it, "This, Gentlemen, is OUR new C———r!" After ſome pains taken to diſcover this officious commentator, how greatly was the foreman of the inqueſt abaſhed to find it was the ſcrawl of a college gyp, who had certainly been expelled without mercy, had it not been pertinently obſerved, that the meaneſt academic might ſometimes be as worthy of the protection and countenance of the chief magiſtrate, as ſome of a ſuperior denomination; and that there could be no particular impropriety, in the writer's claiming to himſelf, and his own fraternity, a ſhare in the bleſſings of our laſt appointment. Had you kept yourſelf to a deſcription of the miniſter, we might have borne it. We are not ſuppoſed to be politicians, and the man in power muſt always be a lawful object to us, who want nothing from a C———r, but his helping-hand to ſtalls, mitres, tranſlations, and other inferior dignities and emoluments preparatory thereunto. The miſtaken world, indeed, has different conceptions; and will needs have it, that in the choice we make of ſo honourable a character, ſome reſpect ſhould be had to the patronage of piety, learning, and virtue; and I doubt not but you have ſufficient ſagacity to apprehend, that we muſt have our reaſons for not undeceiving theſe well-meaning wrongheads. Nothing, therefore, could be more cruel, than after you had expoſed the miniſter, to exhibit the man, "the genius of "whoſe life ſhould have carried him through every "poſſible change and contradiction of conduct, "without the momentary imputation or colour of a "virtue." How effectually do theſe few words cut up by the root every topic of poetical and rhetorical pane-

panegyric, by which ſo many of us thought to have merited at the approaching jubilee? What! not one trace of piety or moral principle to grace the cloſe of a theological determination, or to enliven the dull periods of a creation ſpeech? This was bad enough, but, however, was not all the miſchief we had to apprehend from this ill-ſtarred letter. For coming, as it did, upon the heels of the Middleſex petition, and at the critical moment of a political demurr, the conſternation became general, leſt the yet ſplendid object of our devotions ſhould come down to us, thinned of all its honours, but the bluſhing one we had conferred upon it. *Go to ſupper*, ſaid a wicked whig upon this occaſion, to a venerable aſpirant, *to ſupper, Doctor, with what appetite you may.* And in ſorrowful truth, Junius, ſome of us, at that inſtant, loſt every ray of hope, of completing the elevations of our reſpective plans, which, (the foundations having been laid under the patronage of old N—c—le) were not to be carried up without an uncommon inſight into the myſteries of maſonry. What we had to pull down, and what it coſt us to re-accommodate our plan to the reigning taſte, ſome of us feel, with no agreeable ſenſation, to this hour. And what muſt have befallen us but a Babel confuſion, had the Newcaſtalian Architecture come once more in faſhion at that important period? Thanks to propitious fortune, theſe melancholy apprehenſions are no more. The gracious figure will appear with all its attributes, our fears are diſpelled, our ſenſes are recovered, and I foreſee that the impreſſions made by your ill-favoured exhibition will all be defaced, or at

leaſt obſcured; by the repetition of a late expedient, in which we found our full account without loſing any thing but a little reputation, and that, in theſe days, may very well be ſpared. Have you forgot that we *addreſſed?* Will it ever be forgot, that we ſupplied the little, the very little good we had to ſay on the curators of public affairs, with a plentiful effuſion of bitter intimations on the iniquities of poor Wilkes, the anvil on which every miniſterial expectant for theſe laſt three or four years, has hammered his implements of riſing? Such, Junius, you may be aſſured will be your fate at the approaching feſtival. You may indeed have ſpoiled our panegyrics, but you have not diſarmed our ſatyriſts. You have left us all our ſtores of the *odium politicum*, and you will certainly feel the dire effects of it. The dulleſt of our dull haranguers have been long trained up in this lore by the chief controverſial character among us, and well know how to apply it. In the preſent ſtate of things, and with ſo many convictions on the public mind, it will indeed be impoſſible for the moſt profligate adulation to make your concurrent a ſaint. But with ſo many daily precedents before us from miniſterial hackneys, we can do what will anſwer our preſent purpoſe as well.—We can make *you* a D—l. I am, as much as a diſappointed verſewright can be,

Your humble ſervant,

INCEPTOR.

Cambridge, June 15

LON-

LONDON CHRONICLE, *July* 18, 1769.

To the PRINTER.

SIR,

THE *Country Squire*, in your Chronicle of *June* 6, is certainly miſtaken. Neither are pluralities ſo forbidden, nor reſidence ſo injoined to the clergy by the laws of this land, but that a perſon may be *legally* qualified to hold ſeveral livings with cure of ſouls, and likewiſe *legally* qualified to be non-reſident upon any of them but one, and perhaps in ſome caſes, even upon that one. The *diſpenſations* which operate againſt the prohibition of pluralities and againſt the injunction of reſidence, are certainly *legal*; and that being ſo, the *conſideration* upon which the law or laws prohibiting pluralities, or injoining reſidence, *viz.* that *incumbents may better diſcharge their duties, and overſee their flocks according to the ſcriptures and primitive rules*, muſt either be widely miſtaken by the *Country 'Squire*, or nothing to the purpoſe. For tho' it may ſeem, at firſt ſight, that the office of a chriſtian miniſter indiſpenſably obliges him, with or without an act of parliament, to take due care of his flock according to the ſcriptures, as a matter of the utmoſt importance, and though it ſhould ſeem that this due care cannot be taken by the

the miniſter who never reſides among them, yet no ſooner is a *legal* diſpenſation granted him to reſide elſewhere, than we muſt conclude, that ſome end is anſwered by it of greater importance than the overſight of his flock, according to the ſcriptures. For our law-theoriſts tell us, that "Laws are "never diſpenſed with, but when a greater good "is brought about by the *diſpenſation*, than by the "*execution of the law.*"

We may, perhaps, be a little puzzled to find out, what this *greater good* may be in the caſe under our conſideration, if what the *Country 'Squire* ſays is true, namely, that "of all civilized people "under the heavens, there are none ſo ignorant of "the principles of their religion as the Engliſh, "becauſe there are no people ſo little taught, and "with whom ſo few pains are taken." And for this he ſeems to have ſome authority, from a late eminent prelate, in whoſe writings we read the following period:

"I ſay it with great regret, I have obſerved the "clergy in all the places through which I have "travelled, Papiſts, Lutherans, Calviniſts, and "Diſſenters; but of them all, our clergy is the "moſt remiſs in their labours in private, and the "leaſt ſevere in their lives:" By the account of the *Country 'Squire*, matters are not much mended with us ſince this good Biſhop's time. But, by both their leaves, this *remiſsneſs* and this *little ſeverity*, are ſtrictly *legal*, for by what law are they controuled which is not *legally* diſpenſed with? Or, what is much the ſame thing, which can be executed in above one caſe in ten thouſand?

With reſpect to the *greater good* ariſing from theſe

theſe diſpenſations, I ſhall not pretend to hazard even *one* ſingle conjecture. I know there are ſome philoſophers among us, who think that the common people may be made more uſeful to the ſtate by other ſorts of knowledge, than that of religion, and conſequently that the clergy may be much better employed than in diſpenſing religious inſtruction to the people. I muſt own (but I own it only for myſelf) that there ſeems to be ſome difficulty in admitting this idea into the mind of a chriſtian; but as ſome gentlemen have lately aſſured us, that there is no making any progreſs in divinity, without a competent ſkill in politics and philoſophy (in neither of which I pretend to be an adept) I am inclined to acquieſce; more eſpecially as ſome of the faſteſt friends of the church have demonſtrated, *a priori*, that we ought to take the word of our governors for every thing.

An ATTORNEY.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *July* 22, 1769.

IT is with particular pleaſure I obſerve, that the ingenious and ſpirited *Tyro-Phileleutherus* hath, in your Chronicle of *June* 6, explained himſelf upon the article of the *ſuperior excellence* of the church of England, and hath determined it to conſiſt in her *ſuperior moderation*. By ſpecifying

this particular virtue of the church of England, he hath opened a way to a full juſtification of the writer of the Confeſſional for not acknowledging the *ſuperior excellency of our eccleſiaſtical conſtitution above all others now exiſting*, which, it is hoped, he will accept with his uſual candor.

The excellence of the *eccleſiaſtical* conſtitution of the church of England as ſuch, is to be eſtimated by her *canons*, in which it is probable, after a ſerious peruſal, *Tyro-Phileleutherus* himſelf may not find any ſuperior degree of *Moderation*, and would not perhaps be very well pleaſed with any one who ſhould expect an acknowledgment from him to that effect, even upon a compariſon with any other Proteſtant church now exiſting.

This however, it ſeems, is the light in which the writer of the Confeſſional conſidered theſe *conſtitutions* and *canons eccleſiaſtical* of the church of England; and if ſo, he could not acknowledge their ſuperior moderation with any appearance of ſincerity.

If it ſhould be ſaid, that the *Moderation* of the church of England conſiſts in diſpenſing with the execution of theſe canons, I think it might be anſwered on the part of the writer arraigned,

1. That theſe diſpenſations are not to be put to the account of the moderation of the church, but of the moderation of particular Governors of the church. But as even this moderation is but accidental and perſonal, depending upon the diſpoſition of the particular Prelates to whom the execution of theſe conſtitutions is committed in their ſeveral departments, it ſeems to me, that the writer of the Confeſſional could not,

not, with any propriety, acknowledge this kind of moderation as an *univerſal* virtue, and much leſs as an appendage to the eſtabliſhment of the church of England. And to make particular encomiums on the moderation of particular Prelates, would ſurely have been to go out of his way, to pay mere compliments. Not to mention, that perhaps, in the article of ſubſcriptions, there is leſs room for ſuch compliments, than upon any other circumſtance of church-conformity. It may be anſwered.

2. That the Moderation of the Eſtabliſhment as ſuch, is owing not to the *eccleſiaſtical* conſtitution, but to the interpoſition of the *civil* powers, either by legal reſtraints, upon canonical ſeverity, or by qualifying ſuch ſeverity by other occaſional interference with the rigorous diſpoſition of individuals: and this Moderation, the Writer of The Confeſſional hath acknowledged with thankfulneſs, p. 196 of the 2d edition.

Your Readers, Mr. Printer, will probably obſerve, that the propriety of theſe ſtrictures of the worthy and ingenious *Tyro-Phileleutherus*, depends upon its "being *well known* that the "Writer of The Confeſſional continues to ad- "here to the eſtabliſhment of the Church of "England."

Without queſtioning the fact, I will only beg leave to remark, that this circumſtance ſhould be *perfectly well known* to thoſe who exerciſe their conjectures on the *motives* of ſuch adherence, concerning which, a candid and liberal mind ſhould be extremely tender and cautious of *fixing imputations*; not only from an appre-

henſion of retaliation in the preſent ſtate of things, but from the much more important apprehenſion of infringing the noble rules of Chriſtian Charity. I am, &c.

June 30. PHILELEUTHERUS *jam ſenior.*

P. S. The want of an opportunity of ſeeing the Chronicle of the ſixth inſtant, till a very few days ago, has occaſioned this anſwer to your worthy correſpondent to be ſo long delayed.

For the LONDON CHRONICLE.

Auguſt 15, 1769.

A CARD *to the Rev. Dr.* NOWELL.

Reverend Sir,

I Congratulate you upon your detecting the inſincerity and diſingenuous conduct of that advocate for methodiſm, the author of *Pietas Oxonienſis.*—But a more difficult taſk was yet left you, —the *effectual* clearing the articles of our church from the charge of Calviniſm.—*Iſſachar is a ſtrong aſs, couching down between two burdens.*——The more arduous the undertaking, the more heroiſm in the champion. That you deſigned to do Mother Church a piece of ſervice, I readily believe; —that you have ſucceeded, I much doubt.—You

may

may indeed, among thoſe who are no better acquainted with the ſpirit and deſign of our firſt reformers, and the hiſtory of our reformation, than your opponent, be thought to have performed that piece of drudgery tolerably well.—Your main arguments have been replied to.—It is more particularly in two digreſſions, that you have ſpoken the language of that "keen atmoſphere of wholeſome ſeverities," in which you have been brought up.—In one of your little ſallies, Mr. Public Orator, you thus give mouth:—"*That virulent and abuſive book called the Confeſſional.*" Why in ſuch wrath?—"*Thoſe three excellent letters addreſſed to the author of the Confeſſional.*" Why ſuch compliments?—Let the opinion of the world moderate between your prejudices and intereſt on the one, and truth and reaſon on the other ſide.—The private hiſtory of thoſe three *excellent* letters is generally known; as far, at leaſt, as relates to their birth, parentage, and education.—Now for their life, character, and reputation,—in which muſt conſiſt their boaſted excellency—let the unprejudiced by-ſtander conſult other witneſſes, let him croſs-queſtion, and examine cloſely*.—If theſe do not ſatisfy, let him wait for others who are not yet at the bar.—That judge who giveth judgment,—one ſide only heard,—though he judgeth rightly, judgeth unjuſtly.

In your ſecond reverie, you thus exclaim, "*God grant this church and nation may never again ex-*

* See Dr. Dawſon's addreſs to the author of the firſt letter.—Remarks upon the three.—Animadverſions on an Eſſay on Eſtabliſhments, &c. and ſome very late occaſional remarks, Part II.

" *experience the patriotiſm of ſuch demagogues ; who* " *may indeed be entitled to the encomiums of a Ma-* " *caulay, or a* ———."—This, patriotic Sir, you have clinched with a well-turned period at the bottom, " *I need not acquaint the reader with the* " *political or religious principles of Mrs Macaulay.*" It is good œconomy;—the ſuppoſition that ſuch information is needleſs, ſaves you great pains and trouble.—But this ſhall never paſs for conviction. —This ingenious and ſpirited hiſtorian muſt needs ſhake hands with the author of the Confeſſional,—fellow culprits, whom you (like an itinerant judge) have very ſeaſonably ſtepped out of the road to chaſtiſe with the rod of correction.—While they have dared to diſplay the equal rights of men, well may they fall under the frown of your diſpleaſure.—Civil and religious liberty,—are plants which never throve within your walls.—A warm affection for arbitrary power, and a love of perſecution, (a ſpice of the old leaven) have ever ſtood aloof in your " *ancient and reſpectable ſeminary of* " *true piety and learning.*"—From her antiquity ſhe is become ſuperannuated.—She hath ſhewn her piety by caſhiering devotion,—and her learning, by admitting of the groſſeſt ignorance. A word more, and I have done.—Who but yourſelf, Sir, ever linked together the names of Tillotſon and Laud ?

Who, like you, can call
All oppoſites to proof, and conquer all ?

Tillotſon, an honour to mankind ;—Laud, the baſeſt of all baſe men,—the moſt wretched bigot. —Tillotſon will be remembered in after ages, with immor-

immortal praiſe;—while Laud "never can be ex-"empt from our hatred, unleſs that exemption "ariſes from motives of contempt."

I am,

Rev. SIR,

Yours, &c.

CANTABRIGIENSIS.

Aug. 5, 1769.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Sept.* 21, 1769

THE Berkſhire Clergyman, in your Chronicle of Auguſt 31, hath brought himſelf into an odd dilemma. In the ſame Chronicle, p. 214, is a very alarming account of the influence of a Popiſh Miſſionary, ordained by the Popiſh Biſhop of Quebec, at Halifax in Nova Scotia. If this Miſſionary was ordained by the preſent Biſhop of Quebec, it is certain, that paſſage in Dr. Secker's letter to Mr. Walpole muſt have been foiſted in either by the Archbiſhop himſelf, or ſome perſon for him, long after the date of it in 1751. And this is no bad argument that the whole is ſpurious; for if that paſſage is of ſo late manufacture, why not the reſt of the letter, though not ſo open to detection?

On the other hand, if this Miſſionary (for but one is mentioned in the letter from Halifax) was or-

ordained by a Biſhop of Quebec in or before 1751, and if the important new ſettlement, mentioned by Archbiſhop Secker, means Haliſax, then this has been a growing influence for eighteen years, a good number of which Dr. Secker ſat in the ſee of Canterbury, and affected at leaſt to be particularly ſolicitous about the ſpiritual welfare of the Coloniſts in America. Shall we ſay that he was ſo buſy in providing them Church of England Biſhops, that he had no time to look after the rapid progreſs of Popery in them? no time to expoſtulate with thoſe of our Lay Superiors, who not only did not diſcourage, but actually penſioned a Popiſh Prieſt at double the annual ſum, that has been thought ſufficient for a Proteſtant Miſſionary by the propagating Society? Where was his Grace's vigilance to prevent the ſpread of this pernicious contagion? Or was it a part of his politics, to connive at this Popiſh influence, that he might derive a pretence from thence for the neceſſity of ſettling an Hierarchy of his own ſort in all the Colonies? But the man is gone, and I dare ſay will never be regretted by the friends of civil and religious liberty, and might be well ſuffered to reſt in oblivion, if the High Church Bigots he hath left behind him had not been ſo ſolicitous to have him canonized, or if he himſelf had not contrived, by his poſthumous letter to Mr. Walpole, to keep alive the miſchievous diſſentions between America and the Mother Country, as long and as far as his impotent abuſe of Diſſenters, and his invidious miſrepreſentation of thoſe in the

Co-

Colonies, in particular, might be ſuppoſed to remain and to reach.

That the Papiſts indeed have but too many good friends, on this ſide the water, is a melancholy truth, much lamented by the friends of the illuſtrious Houſe of Hanover, and of the Proteſtant Religion. Nor can we any longer wonder at the increaſing inſolence of the Papiſts for ſome time paſt, if it be true that they can obtain ſuch appointments from Government for their Miſſionaries, as are mentioned in the letter. In the mean time, what muſt be thought of the miniſters of that Government, who are chargeable with even permitting ſuch appointments? Many grievances are imputed to them, againſt which his Majeſty's loyal and affectionate ſubjects are ſeeking redreſs. It is to be hoped the encouragement given to Papiſts, and particularly the introduction of them to places where none but Proteſtant faces ought ever to be ſeen, will not be forgot. The apprehenſions of the people of farther evils from lawleſs and deſpotic counſels have been much ridiculed by the venal tools of the Thane and his Junto. But if this article is true concerning the appointment in Nova Scotia, obtained by the Miſſionaries' friends on this ſide the water, I leave every honeſt man to judge what we have to apprehend may be the event.

Awake, ye ſons of Levi, who call yourſelves the watchmen of the Church of England. Wipe off the reproach, which has ſo long ſtuck to you, of ſlumbering over your flocks, while the Romiſh wolves have been devouring them. It is not only the danger of the common people that ought to alarm

alarm you, but likewiſe of your gracious Sovereign, and of the bleſſings neither you nor we can enjoy, while he is unſafe from the machinations of theſe intolerant monſters, who put on all diſguiſes to compaſs the deſtruction of thoſe who will not put themſelves into the ſame ſtate of abject ſlavery, to which they are bound, by the moſt odious of all bonds, thoſe of ſuperſtition. I am,

SIR,

CHREMES.

For the LONDON CHRONICLE.

Nov. 23, 1769.

To the Reverend the DIGNIFIED CLERGY *of the Church of* ENGLAND.

GENTLEMEN,

SUFFER, I beſeech you, a word of exhortation from a well-meaning layman, on the ſubject of reformation. Nay, ſtart not, gentlemen, at the word *reformation*. I mean not to touch your confeſſions of faith with one of my fingers. Continue to ſubſcribe them *ex animo*, in the lump. Believe as much of them as you can, and explain away the reſt, to the confuſion of the methodiſts, and of every man who pretends to underſtand the words in their ſeemingly natural import. If your predeceſſors had authority to interpret the ſcriptures for the

the people, why ſhould not you have authority to interpret your predeceſſors?

As little do I pretend to meddle with your Commendams, Pluralities, Diſpenſations, and Sinecures. If you have not *geſpel* for theſe, you have *law*, and that (as hath been obſerved in the caſe of *Tythes*) is the much ſecurer title. And if theſe things give ſcandal to weak chriſtians, you may ſay, "So did chriſtianity itſelf to weak Jews and "Heathens." And why ſhould *your* liberty be judged of *other men*'s conſciences? May you long enjoy theſe rewards of your *merit* and *integrity*.

My preſent buſineſs with you, is only to recommend to your attention *the public manners of your country*; which by ſome of us leſs inlightened laymen, are thought to deſerve it, particularly in the articles of public entertainment and diverſion, to which, for the preſent, I intend to confine my humble remonſtrances.

I have ſat under many of you, gentlemen, with no little admiratiom of your talents, while you have been demonſtrating the *chearfulneſs* of the chriſtian religion, from that excellent text of St. Paul, *Rejoice in the Lord always, and again I ſay rejoice.* I have heard you inferring from theſe words, not only the *innocence*, the *lawfulneſs*, and the *utility*, but the *duty* of diverting ourſelves in any way or manner which may happen to be the faſhion of the country where we ſojourn; and ſome of you have made it a queſtion, and left it undetermined, whether, as the precept is repeated, not without ſome ſeeming warmth, any man could pretend to ſet any bounds to the practice, or to ſay, at what point the exceſs of it begins?

But though, as I ſaid, I was entertained, I cannot ſay I was much edified by this divinity. I had ſome ſcruples whether *all* our modes of public rejoicing might, with ſufficient propriety, be called *rejoicing in the Lord*, ſuch of them particularly, as implied in the conduct of them, that the pious aſſiſtants, while they were intent upon the *duty* of rejoicing, ſeemed to be totally inſenſible that any other duty was preſcribed in the book from whence the text is taken. Nor could I ever perſuade myſelf that the Apoſtle could poſſibly mean, that we ſhould be ſo zealous in practiſing this precept of our religion, that the deſtruction of the honeſt induſtry and the total corruption of the integrity of our fellow citizens ſhould be the effect of it. And I cannot but hope that many of you are of the ſame mind.

To be ſerious, gentlemen, we hear ſo little from you on this intereſting ſubject, that we are greatly at a loſs to account for your ſilence and acquieſcence, in a caſe which affords ſo large a field for your paſtoral inſtruction and reproof.

In the days of Charles II. when *eaſe* and *freedom*, and an univerſal conformity of the *eſtabliſhed* clergy to the *innocent manners* as well as the *orthodox principles* of the people in power, were abſolutely neceſſary to contraſt the peeviſh ſcruples and the provoking ſobriety of the diſſenting party, and to make them ridiculous in the eyes of the better bred church-men, theſe rejoicing doctrines, and a ſuitable practice were ſeaſonable enough: Though even then, as ſome remaining memorials of thoſe times inform us, there were among the epiſcopal clergy ſome who bore their teſtimony againſt the

public

public diſſipation of their reſpective flocks, and even of the courtiers themſelves, when they had a turn in the royal chapel; where one of them was heard to ſay, that the ſtability of the King's church would be dearly purchaſed by making an alliance with the church of the devil; as he was pleaſed to call the playhouſe, and other places of ſportive exhibition: But I ſuppoſe the man was half a puritan, and probably not in the ſecret.

But though this complaiſance for the religion of the ſtate, might be a neceſſary expedient in thoſe days to keep men and things *tight* to the eſtabliſhment, yet there ſhould ſeem to be no great demand, at this time, for ſuch a profuſion of entertainment for the like purpoſes. Our modern diſſenters are getting faſt into more liberal notions concerning practical ſerioufneſs, as well as eccleſiaſtical modes of worſhip. They have already adopted in ſeveral places the pudding-ſleeve and the organ, and it is not to be doubted, but by degrees, they will come into the ſurplice and the altar-piece. In proportion as they improve in theſe articles, they have poliſhed their taſte for muſical entertainments, carding parties, theatrical ſpectacles and exhibitions, and other amuſements of the times. The very ſoureſt of the ancient anti-epiſcopalians, the *North Britons*, have now their theatres, their aſſembly-rooms, and muſical flouriſhes in their churches; and, it is believed, will in another ſeaſon or two, have their *Vauxhall* and their *Ranelagh*. Even the quakers have many of them laid aſide the ſimplicity of their ancient attire, and figure in brocades and ruffles, aud ſeem to be in a hopeful progreſſion towards

wards farther elegancies and carnal politeneſſes now in vogue.

It is true, the ſerious part of their teachers ſee this with concern, and much inward mortification, but they are ſenſible whence it is derived, namely, from the unedifying example of the ſtaunch churchmen, who have gone on ſo long in an unreſtrained and almoſt unreproved courſe of licentiouſneſs, and diſſipation. "Conſider," (ſays a ſenſible quaker the other day, to a faſhionable dignitary, who was ſneering him on this viſible alteration in the deportment of friends) "conſider who they are "that have laid this obligation upon us. Conſi- "der who they are who have never ceaſed to ridi- "cule our pretenſions to vital chriſtianity, and "that heart-felt purity, which teaches another "leſſon, and leads to a better practice. Is it won- "derful that our youth, indued with the common "paſſions of humanity, ſhould leave their proper "and faithful guides, to follow thoſe who pro- "phecy ſmoother things to them, and aſſociate "rather with thoſe, who accommodate them with "ways and means to reconcile theſe things to a "certain portion of religion, than with thoſe who "inſiſt that theſe vanities are at variance with "every idea of chriſtian piety and holineſs. Thou "art thyſelf a teacher of chriſtianity. Whether "thou ever toucheſt upon this ſubject I am igno- "rant: but am very well ſatisfied, that thy au- "diences would be extremely thin, if thy doctrine "was not perfectly reconcileable with the rites "and ceremonies of the High Prieſteſs C—rn—ys, "of the tall Baronet, and of the Grand Director "of a late Jubilee, who contrived by hymns

"pro

" proceſſions, games, &c. to make a true heathen
" idol of a deceaſed fellow creature, who though
" greatly excellent in his way, owed all his excel-
" lencies to the giver of all good gifts, of whom
" no ſerious mention was made that I could hear
" of*. Hath any one of thy fathers or thy bre-
" thren opened his mouth, or drawn his pen in
" reproof of theſe abominations, the ſcandals to
" the proteſtant reformation, and particularly to
" thoſe divine inſtructions on which even ye are
" obliged to confeſs it is founded? Be aſhamed
" for thy ſelf and thy brethren in the firſt place,
" before thou turneſt thy ſcoffs and ſcorns upon
" us."

Thus far my friend *Iſrael*, who ſeems however not to be aware of what may be anſwered to ſuch remonſtrances as theſe. I doubt not, Gentlemen, but you may judge it expedient upon the plan of church-policy above-mentioned, to keep a-head of theſe aſpiring Puritans, in ſecular conformities of this nature. Their teachers ſeem, *as yet*, to be a little upon the reſerve in theſe matters, nor are they very forward to mix in theſe ſprightly parties of *fun* and *mummery;* not one of which, if I am rightly informed, is without a conſiderable number of the *Bob Jeroms* of the eſtabliſhment. It is not long ago, that the public prints give us an account, that a certain ——, who has not always been ſo merrily diſpoſed, appeared at a brilliant aſ-

* Mr. B—ſ—ll could have wiſhed, that prayers had been read, and a ſhort ſermon preached, by way of conſecrating the jubilee. Would not high maſs have been more in character, and ſomething better accommodated to the devotion of the aſſiſtants?

aſſembly, in the metropolis of his dioceſe, to the great edification of the company, and the particular encouragement of his inferiors of the order. It was however hinted at the ſame time, that this *manœuvre* was not ſo much calculated to exemplify the dignity of the church, as to vindicate the righteouſneſs of our politics; in conſequence of a miniſterial commiſſion to aſſiſt in ſtifling a certain Petition, the contents of which were likely to make their way to the common ſenſe and common feelings of the country, which upon this occaſion, were to be confounded and benumbed.

Excuſe me, good Sirs, if I cannot wholly approve either of the ſtate or the church policy of encouraging theſe practices in your reſpective departments. There are at this very time, and to my certain knowledge, members of the church of England, every way reſpectable, who execrate theſe unſeemly revels from their very ſoul, *ſome* from a deep ſenſe of their tendency to baniſh all true religion and virtue from the land; and *others* from the curſed influence they have upon their reſpective families, by corrupting the minds, deſtroying the principles, and enervating the honeſt induſtry of their children and ſervants, and forcing them into a ruinous expence, merely to avoid, among a ſilly and a thoughtleſs, but, to them, a conſequential part of the world, the reputation of being methodiſts. Can your ſilence, Gentlemen, your indifference, your conformity to theſe pernicious modes, raiſe your eſtimation among ſuch as theſe? Will this indolent, this mean ſuppreſſion of your teſtimony in ſo flagrant a caſe, raiſe you above ridicule and contempt, even among thoſe whom

whom you think to oblige by it! No, Gentlemen, depend upon it, if abſolute ruin is not already determined upon us in the wiſe counſels of providence, the public will rouſe from this unmanly lethargy, this effeminate dream of licentious pleaſure, by its own good ſenſe, or perhaps by the acute and painful ſenſations of its pernicious effects, when they will undoubtedly ſee at once the abſurdity of heaping honours and emoluments upon nominal watchmen, who have been as faſt aſleep as themſelves; and will take effectual meaſures to prevent all future diſappointments from the ſame quarter.

I am,

GENTLEMEN, *&c.*

LATIMERUS LAICUS.

ST. JAMES'S CHRONICLE, *Dec.* 28, 1769.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Quis—tam ferreus ut teneat ſe?*

IT is now, Mr. Baldwin, about two years ſince you publiſhed my dying ſpeech to the great ſatisfaction of a deceaſed Prelate, who, I dare ſay, took it for granted, I ſhould be fairly tucked up immediately. So, however, it happened, that a reprieve came juſt in time, and I am ſtill alive,

though not ſo merry as I ſhould have been, had the good people, for whoſe benefit my laſt inſtructions were intended, paid that attention to them, which is thought to be due to the admonitions of every departing penitent.

The ſubſtance of my exhortations has been, to keep a good look-out upon the manœuvres of the clergy, leſt their opulence, and conſequently their power, ſhould riſe above *par*, that is to ſay, above that proportion of each, which is neceſſary for diſcharging the duty of chriſtian paſtors, watching for the ſouls of a proteſtant people.

It was, on ſeveral occaſions, ſuggeſted by me, that the ſuperior clergy, with more wealth and power in their hands than their original code of diſcipline preſcribes, have, in all ages, favoured the plans of civil deſpotiſm, contrived by corrupt ſtateſmen for the humiliation of the people; whoſe conſciences, by virtue of a ſecret alliance, have reciprocally been conſigned by the ſtate politician, to the management of the church.

Matters ſeemed to me, ſome years ago, to have a tendency of this kind among ourſelves. A ſuppoſed ſon of Levi made his boaſt in print, that the ſtate hath more need of the aid of the church, than the church hath of the aid of the ſtate. This has paſſed without the leaſt cenſure, and the confidence of this claſs of men hath ſo far accordingly improved, that in another dying ſpeech of the deceaſed Prelate above-mentioned, publiſhed in the ſummer of this preſent year 1769, a miniſter of ſtate is told, that in order to carry a certain church point, of no ſmall conſequence to the religious liberty of a numerous and reſpectable body

of

of his Majeſty's ſubjects, " it did not ſeem to be " neceſſary it ſhould be brought into parliament;" and that, ſhould it be neceſſary, " the miniſter " might eaſily carry it, by the help of his friends " (meaning his dependants) and the tories, (the " point to be debated being of that complexion) " and for the reſt, ſays this moſt politic hierarch, " they would find themſelves too inconſiderable to " ſtir."

Happily for the public, the miniſter to whom this counſel was given, had good ſenſe and integrity enough to deſpiſe it. It ſhould ſeem, however, as if either this great dignitary or ſome of his kidney, had found a little more reſpect and complaiſance in ſucceeding times. This ſurmiſe ariſes from a circumſtance in a printed ſheet which lately fell into my hands, intituled, *The Caſe of the Proteſtant Diſſenters in* Nova Scotia.

In this very affecting caſe, it is ſet forth, That out of twenty townſhips in that province, there are no leſs than twelve, where the proteſtant diſſenters have no miniſters: That the proteſtant diſſenters in that province, amount to near nine thouſand: That the reſt of the inhabitants (amounting to between four and five thouſand) " are " either of the eſtabliſhed church of England, for " the ſupport of whoſe miniſters a legal and cer- " tain proviſion is made; or of the church of " Rome, who, for reaſons of ſtate, are allowed to " have a prieſt among them, with a maintenance " provided for him."

The circumſtances of the lay-inhabitants of Nova Scotia, of all denominations, I will take it for granted, are much the ſame, and that they are all

equally unable to provide for their miniſters reſpectively. The miniſters of the two epiſcopal churches are provided for, as it ſhould ſeem, by authority. The proteſtant diſſenters are left to provide for themſelves. I ſhould be glad to know, what reaſons of ſtate can be given for this partiality?

I obſerve it is ſaid in the caſe, that a legal proviſion is made for the miniſters of the eſtabliſhed church; but it is not ſaid that the maintenance provided for the popiſh prieſt is legal. I would aſk again, what reaſons of ſtate can be given for providing a maintenance for a man, who is under a legal incapacity to receive it?

A ſtrict alliance between papiſts and a ſort of people called Thaniſts has been manifeſt for ſome time; the latter have inſulted the good ſenſe and the conſtitutional principles of the moſt faithful of his Majeſty's ſubjects for a long time with impunity; the former have joined them with an inſolence unknown, except in the years 1715 and 1745. Still it is incredible to me, that any part of the money raiſed upon the ſubject for the ſupport of our proteſtant government, ſhould be employed for the maintenance of the moſt inveterate and determined of its enemies. I muſt believe, that even the aſſurance of a Thaniſt would not venture to take ſuch a ſtep.

I would therefore only aſk a few more queſtions relative to this very myſterious tranſaction: Are there not reaſons of church, as well as reaſons of ſtate, to be given for it? Are the church of England miniſters, and the popiſh prieſt in Nova Scotia, provided for and maintained out of the

ſame

ſame fund? Or, are they not? Is nothing *concealed* with reſpect to the papiſts in Nova Scotia, in this ſtate of the caſe of the proteſtant diſſenters? It is ſaid in the caſe, that there is in town a reſpectable diſſenting miniſter, ſent over by the diſtreſſed diſſenters in that country to ſolicit contributions towards the maintenance of their miniſters. Hath he applied to the governing powers, eccleſiaſtical and civil, for their countenance and protection in this ſolicitation? What was his encouragement from each? If reaſons of ſtate were ever given, why the civil powers could not interpoſe on the behalf of the proteſtant diſſenters, were they not always taken from the inexpedience of diſobliging the church? If ſo, may we not ſuppoſe that the reaſons of ſtate for providing for the maintenance of a popiſh prieſt, do not imply the like obſtruction? Is there not in this printed caſe, a national grievance highly worthy of the notice, and the ſevere cenſure, of all true patriots? I am,

Mr. Baldwin,

Your old correſpondent,

And humble ſervant,

PLEBEIUS.

LONDON CHRONICLE, *Feb.* 20, 1770.

To the PRINTER.

SIR,

IT cannot but mortify the real friends of a late Prelate to ſee the imprudence of his encomiaſts in bringing him upon the ſtage with ſuch motley and inconſiſtent repreſentations of his ſuppoſed excellencies. It had become theſe occaſional champions, to have previouſly laid their heads together, and to have compiled a character for his Grace, as a ſtandard from which they ſhould not have departed a ſtraw breadth, whatever facts or evidences had been brought from the inimical quarter to contraſt it. Your Correſpondent, Mr. Printer, who calls himſelf *A Friend to Toleration*, is the very worſt of all the deceaſed Prelate's advocates, only becauſe he is the moſt long-winded, and conſequently the moſt abounding in abſurdities. Who the Commentator is that hath enraged him ſo much, I do not pretend to know; but this I can ſay, that, whoever he is, ſuch antagoniſts will do him no great harm. The cenſor begins moſt inauſpiciouſly, with arraigning a quotation as a *falſe one*, becauſe it hath a whole ſentence in it more than the letter has; what he means by this, it is impoſ-

ſible

ſible to find out; but the objection comes very awkwardly from a man, who at that inſtant was animadverting upon a quotation, which does not amount to *half a ſentence.*

In the next place he tells us, that "the *antiqui* "*regiminis forma & vis*, means *no more*, than that "ancient authority of Convocation, which is more "particularly deſcribed in the ſame charge, where "his Grace expreſly declares his abhorrence of all "*former* abuſes of that authority." But what better are we for his Grace's *Declarations*, if the authority itſelf, which he wanted to have reſtored, was an *abuſe*, and an *uſurpation* upon Chriſtian Liberty? An *abuſe* and *uſurpation*, which a real *friend to univerſal toleration* would deteſt and abhor.

Whether the Letter to Mr. *Walpole* is genuine or ſpurious, is not worth a moment's contention. After all that can be ſaid of it, it is, and it will be, but *a poor little ſixpenny pamphlet*, moſt miſerably executed, even for the ſiniſter purpoſes for which it was contrived. Nor is it of more conſequence whether the writer of it meant *Canada* or *Nova Scotia*; as, for any thing that yet appears, the good Prelate was equally paſſive in both caſes. I ſay, *for any thing that* yet *appears*, for though this man ſays, his Grace did remonſtrate, earneſtly and repeatedly againſt the *Canada* Biſhop, and alſo aſſerted the ſame under the title of *Academicus*, yet *Cantianus* in your Chronicle of Feb. 8, flatly contradicts him, and declares, that his Grace knew not of the appointment till the new Biſhop was ready to ſail.

To the compariſon of the two Prelates *Secker* and *Sherlock*, I ſhall only ſay, *Qui Bavium non odit, amet tua carmina Mævi.* Whoever prefers the late Primate to the late Biſhop *Sherlock*, has my leave to prefer the judgment of this hot-headed *Univerſaliſt*, to that of the Monthly Reviewers.

Dr. *Bradbury Chandler*, introducing his former pamphlet to the public, openly anounced the patronage and countenance of Archbiſhop *Secker*, in their common project of bringing *America* under the epiſcopal yoke. The Archbiſhop never *diſowned* Dr. *Chandler*. Are they not then to be conſidered as anſwerable for one another, throughout the whole proceſs?

What intelligence the Commentator might have of his Grace's anxieties with reſpect to News-paper eſſays, I am ignorant; but it is notoriouſly known that many of the *contradictory* eſſays, mentioned by this Writer, were from his Grace's own hand.—Notoriouſly known, ſometimes by the ſignature, oftener by the ſtyle: and ſome in particular I could point out, which had been certainly with-held, if *diſtreſſing* the Proteſtant Diſſenters, in order to their *converſion*, had not been his *benevolent* object. If theſe teazing reſcripts gave his Grace no *uneaſineſs*, great was his condeſcenſion in taking all theſe *calm* and *gratuitous* pains, merely for the entertainment of the public.

Looking into the *Commentary* for the occaſion of the Commentator's *reſentment*, I find it was raiſed by an unjuſt as well as injudicious compliment paid by Dr. *M——m* to the late Archbiſhop, at the expence of every other Prelate on the Bench, which this Gentleman ſeems to adopt with ſufficient

cient aſſurance, calling it *a juſt applauſe*. Is it any wonder, that upon ſuch an inſult, even the tameſt writer, who is acquainted with the truth of the caſe, ſhould be put beyond his patience?

That a junto of men of the ſame caſt and turn with the late Primate, ſhould be out of humour with Dr. *Sharpe* for juſtifying himſelf at the expence both of the Primate's judgment and candor, and ſhould in the warmth of that provocation, decry the Doctor's pamphlet, is by no means marvellous. But that is all the *diſgrace* the performance has met with. Out of *the atmoſphere of wholeſome ſeverities*, it has been generally well received and even applauded. Nor is it for the credit of any one to take offence at a writing, merely out of perſonal friendſhip for, and admiration of, the man who gave ſo juſt occaſion for the contents of it.

The *Friend to univerſal Toleration* queſtions, "Whether it be poſſible for any one, *conſiſtently* "*with the principles of toleration*, to oppoſe the "eſtabliſhment of Biſhops in America?" Which is equivalent to a queſtion, whether any man can, conſiſtently with the principles of toleration, oppoſe the eſtabliſhment of Popiſh Biſhops in England? *Eſtabliſhment* in both caſes, muſt mean a *civil* eſtabliſhment—the civil eſtabliſhment of the power and rule peculiar to modern Epiſcopacy. In this light what Popiſh Biſhops are to Engliſh Proteſtants, Church of England Biſhops are to American Proteſtants, the bulk of whom are Nonconformiſts, whoſe forefathers as ſurely fled into America from the face of Church of England Biſhops, as ſome

of our forefathers fled into Germany from the face of Queen Mary's bloody Biſhops.

O, but American Biſhops would be of a milder ſtamp than their Laudæan Prototypes. Perhaps they might, perhaps not: It is not at all unreaſonable to require a ſubſtantial Under-writer to this inſurance: for if they ſhould prove to be chips of the old block, adieu to all toleration for the non-conforming Americans. The good pacific Catholics of this country tell us, *their* Biſhops are as meek as lambs in compariſon with the *Bonners* and *Gardiners* of the Marian days. But if with the reſtoration of the Archbiſhop's *form* and *force of the ancient regimen* in their view, they ſhould make theſe pretences, my principles of toleration would not be ſhocked in the leaſt by endeavouring to exclude them. I am,

SIR, &c.

VIGIL.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Feb.* 22, 1770.

HAVING ſeen two letters in your Chronicle, the one ſigned, *Atlanticus*, the other, *Academicus*, concerning the part a late Primate did, or did not take, with reſpect to the appointment of a Popiſh Biſhop now ſtationed at Quebec, I am induced

duced to requeſt a place in your paper for the following conſiderations, which may, perhaps, contribute to throw ſome light upon a queſtion, in which, as I apprehend, the public is deeply intereſted. *Academicus* aſſerts, that the Primate "remonſtrated *ſtrenuouſly* and *repeatedly* againſt the "meaſure to thoſe in power, but without ſucceſs." It is nevertheleſs certain, that ſome of the Primate's intimate friends, being aſked ſoon after the meaſure took place, why his Grace did not interpoſe to prevent it? anſwered, that "his Grace did "not know of it, till the man had embarked, and "then it was too late." This anſwer was then thought to be a ſtrange one, conſidering that the public papers (and if I miſtake not, Mr. Printer, your Chronicle among the reſt) announced the man, as arrived in London, and waiting for his credentials, ſome weeks before he embarked; nor forgetting to give him a name, or to characterize his perſon and accompliſhments. Some time before his arrival in this kingdom, namely April 26, 1766, the *Daily Gazetteer* exhibited the following paragraph: "We are informed that the Pope has "obtained leave to ſend over a Biſhop of his "church, to Canada." To which was immediately ſubjoined another in theſe words: "The "ſending over ſome Engliſh Biſhops, under pro"per reſtrictions, to our colonies and ſettlements "abroad, has been a meaſure ſtrongly recommend"ed by many well-wiſhers to the church of Eng"land, and a handſome benefaction has been late"ly left by a gentleman to ſupport ſo uſeful an "eſtabliſhment." At the time this intelligence appeared, it was generally ſuppoſed to be ſent

from the ſurry ſide of the Thames; and that the latter was the *only* inference it was thought *neceſſary* there, to draw from ſo remarkable a fact.

It is poſſible, however, that this might be a groundleſs conjecture, and that the Primate had really no notice, that ſuch a conceſſion was made to his holineſs, till the affair took place as above. In that caſe it muſt be allowed, that *Atlanticus* was miſtaken: His Grace could not be ſaid either to *wink at*, or *puſh on* a meaſure, to which he was an utter ſtranger. But then we muſt acknowledge that *Academicus* is likewiſe miſtaken, as the Primate cannot be ſuppoſed to have remonſtrated againſt a tranſaction of which he was totally ignorant.

But let us for a moment ſuppoſe that the primate knew of this affair: what evidence is there that he remonſtrated againſt it? None but the word of a nameleſs *Academic*, which, if it is taken as authentic, will imply (unſupported as it is) that theſe *remonſtrances* were as *clandeſtine* as the appointment of the Popiſh Biſhop, and that the *remonſtrant* was very eaſily ſatisfied, A truly zealous Chief Governor of the proteſtant church of *England*, far from being diſcouraged by a miniſterial rebuff, would have gone openly and publicly at the head of his brethren to the fountain of political power, and would have preferred a joint petition, that a meaſure ſo nearly connected with manifeſt danger to the civil and religious conſtitution of this country, and ſo particularly inauſpicious to the proteſtant ſettlement of the Britiſh government, might be inſtantly ſuperſeded. I do not ſpeak without authority, when I ſay, that in conſequence of ſuch

an

an application, the eſtabliſhment of a Popiſh Biſhop in *Canada* would *not* have taken place: or if it had, the Primate would have delivered his own ſoul, and the ſouls of his brethren, before God and the whole world; an advantage which the feeble teſtimony of *Academicus*, as matters now ſtand, will not derive upon him. The Primate ſtood, on this occaſion, in the eye of the public, as a ſilent and paſſive looker-on. Some perſons were ſhy of aſſigning reaſons for his acquieſcence, and contented themſelves with *hoping his own* were good ones.

Others were not ſo patient, but plainly expreſſed their apprehenſions that the Popiſh Prelate would be made uſe of as a *precedent* for eſtabliſhing church of England Biſhops in our colonies on ſome future occaſion. And ſome were the more forward to give this as the reaſon of the Primate's *neutrality*, in that he had actually formed a concluſion in favour of a project for epiſcopizing all *America*, upon the *inoffenſiveneſs* of Popiſh Biſhops at home, even in the full exerciſe of *all* their *functions*. I muſt be free to own, that this argument, which the Primate advanced in his anſwer to Dr. *Mayhew* of *Boſton* (long before the affair of the *Canada* Biſhop came upon the carpet) convinces me, that *Academicus* has not been well informed concerning the Primate's remonſtrances againſt my Lord of *Quebec*. For, being ſo very eaſy about Popiſh Biſhops in the very midſt of his own peculiar flock (where the moſt ſerious proteſtants think they have done, and are ſtill doing, the moſt ſubſtantial miſchief) is it likely he ſhould trouble himſelf to remonſtrate againſt a man, whoſe actions and exploits would not

not fall within his obſervation, and for whoſe miſdeeds he would not be ſo immediately anſwerable, as for depredations made under his eye, and in his own domeſtic department? That all this is more than mere ſuppoſition appears from a moſt ſtriking fact. The Primate, in his day, not only preſided over, but was, as one may ſay, the very ſoul of a certain propagating ſociety, whence all the annual harangues were attuned to his key. In one of the very laſt of theſe exhibited before the Primate's demiſe, that our plantations abroad had Popiſh Biſhops and Popiſh ſeminaries (though *Canada* was the only one *then* known to be ſo furniſhed) was urged as an argument, why Proteſtant Biſhops ſhould be eſtabliſhed in *America*. One more fact and I have done. His Grace's influence with the propagating ſociety is well known, and has already been mentioned. When the Primate found that his ſtrenuous and repeated remonſtrances to thoſe in power were without effect, what could be more natural than for him to try to counteract the popiſh Biſhop in his new province, by ſuch means as were more in his power, than the appointment of another Biſhop of the church of England for that province? What more natural than to ſend a competent number of able, learned, and truly proteſtant miſſionaries to balance the reſtleſs efforts of the popiſh hierarchy in that quarter? Did the Primate ever propoſe this expedient to the ſociety? Was the propoſal diſapproved? Was he *ſtrenuous* in his remonſtrances? Did he *repeat* them as occaſion offered? And were his endeavours finally without ſucceſs? Let who will, or who can, anſwer

ſwer theſe queſtions, the matter of fact is, that on the 17th of *February*, 1769, *not one miſſionary was employed in the whole province of* CANADA.

I am, &c.

CANTABRIGIENSIS.

POSTSCRIPT *to* CANTIANUS's LETTER.

TO end all doubts and diſputes about the Canadian Biſhop, *Cantianus* begs leave to aſſure *Atlanticus*, *Academicus*, &c. that he himſelf heard the late Primate affirm, that he knew not of that popiſh Prelate's being in England, till he heard it accidentally at Dover, with the other particulars mentioned in *Cantianus*'s former letter.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Feb.* 24, 1770.

IT is an obſervation of the late Biſhop *Sherlock*, that every "heart, that is alienated from a "ſenſe of God and religion, carries off with it a "pair of hands from the defence of the public." There have been, however, philoſophers, who have

have contended, that the irreligious principles of an atheiſt, as ſuch, do not neceſſarily diſqualify him from being an uſeful member of civil ſociety, or even a warm and active friend of the public. A ſmall alteration in the ſentence will make it leſs problematical, viz. "Every heart, that is alie-"nated from the proteſtant religion, carries off "with it a pair of hands from the defence of our "proteſtant conſtitution;" and not only that, but adds that pair of hands to the ſtrength of the determined enemies of our civil and religious liberties. With this plain truth before us, it will not be eaſy to account for the patience of the public in paſſively looking on, while the numerous miſſionaries, ſwarming in this country, are openly and avowedly perverting his Majeſty's ſubjects to that vile ſuperſtition, which of courſe brings a proteſtant King and a proteſtant People into the utmoſt contempt and hatred with the deluded proſelyte.

I am not now ſpeaking of popery as a *religious*, but as a *political* profeſſion. That a proteſtant or chriſtian people ſhould not be ſeduced to worſhip idols of wood and ſtone, *graven by art and man's device*, ſhould be the care of their ſpiritual paſtors. How they diſcharge that important truſt, is a matter of conſcience to themſelves, and ſhould in ſome degree, be the concern of thoſe who pay them ſo liberally for this eſſential ſervice.

In the mean time popery ſpreads, is rampant, inſolent, and unabaſhed; rejoices in the humiliation of public liberty, and avowedly joins itſelf to the party which oppreſſes it. And the adoption of this coadjutor by thoſe who glory in their *firmneſs* and *perſeverance* in thoſe meaſures which are now the

the ſubject of public complaint, ſeems to be as proper an object of our ſpirited patriots, as any other concerning which they are ſo laudably exerting their endeavours; and it is the aſtoniſhment of numbers who pray for the proſperity of the cauſe they have in hand, that this capital grievance has not fallen more immediately under their conſideration; the rather, as it is not to be conſidered as a branch growing out of the ſtock, but as a rich compoſt, manuring the root of the tree of deſpotiſm, from which all our late grievances have ſprung.

I will not enquire what are the *true* reaſons, why the papiſts are become ſo prime favourites with our modern miniſterial men, becauſe I am a ſtranger to their particular views, which, however, there is a cauſe to apprehend, are by no means auſpicious to the peace and proſperity of our Iſrael: but I have a ready anſwer for the *eſtenſible* reaſon which has been given, when the queſtion has been put to ſome men in power, *Why all this indulgence, and even partiality to papiſts, beyond what has been known, ſince the proteſtant ſettlement took place?*

The reaſon is, that "the Roman Catholics of "Great Britain and Ireland are not ſo obnoxious "to *government* as heretofore, but are become as "well affected ſubjects to the crown, as any other "claſs of men whatever."

One might aſk, what is here meant by the word *government*, which it ſhould ſeem, means ſomething ſubſiſting upon an intereſt diſtinct from that of his Majeſty's proteſtant ſubjects; for it is moſt notorious, that popery and Papiſts are juſt as obnoxious

to

to the people of this country in general, and juſt as diſaffected to the means and meaſures of their true happineſs, as ever.

It is no new thing, that corrupt and profligate courtiers ſhould perſuade an amiable Prince, inclined to think well of all his ſubjects, into the belief of ſo ſtrange a paradox. But let us admit it to be true in the ſenſe in which only they can mean it, was popery proſcribed from this country merely for the ſake of the crown? Was not the ſafety and ſecurity of the people equally at leaſt concerned in this proſcription? Do not the proſcribing laws prove this beyond diſpute? And ſhall it be ſafe for any miniſter to elude or evade the force of thoſe laws, merely to favour a model of government, wherein the ſecurity and welfare of the public do not come into conſideration?

Far different was the ſenſe of our pious, virtuous, and ſpirited anceſtors, far different *has been* the ſenſe of ſome of our leading divines on this intereſting and affecting ſubject. Biſhop *Sherlock* (with whom I began) in a ſermon by him preached, during the rebellion in 1715, after enumerating the evils of popery, and putting his audience in mind of the affection and duty they owed to that excellent ſovereign upon the throne, as "the protector of themſelves, their religion, their country, their friends and families," adds, "All "theſe motives plead not ſo much *for him*, as *for* "*ourſelves*." The indulgence of popery, as a part of a miniſterial project, can never be a matter of indifference to the proteſtants of Great Britain. The ſafety of a free people abſolutely depends upon the depreſſion of all thoſe who by their principles,

ciples, devote that people in their hearts and conſciences to ſlavery and deſtruction. Our anceſtors have wiſely provided us with excellent laws for our ſecurity againſt this peſtilent, treacherous, and intolerant ſyſtem; and we have a right to demand the ſtrict and impartial execution of them; we have a right to call upon our guardians to be active and vigilant in this important branch of their duty. The nation has been thrown into a flame by precarious notions of *incapacity* advanced to diſable a man, who, whatever he is beſides, is a warm affectionate friend to the rights and liberties of his fellow ſubjects, and of the proteſtant ſettlement of the crown, by which they are underſtood to be ſecured to us. And ſhall we tamely leave the known and determined foes to our conſtitution, who are under real, indiſputable, becauſe *legal*, incapacities, to range at large without reſtraint, and under a confidence of more than political connivance, to exert, both by themſelves and their emiſſaries, a moſt pernicious and unnatural influence, to corrupt our people, and to ſap the foundations upon which the happineſs of ourſelves and our poſterity abſolutely depend?

BILLA VERA.

ADVER-

Feb. 26, 1770.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE INCORPORATED SOCIETY for the Propagation of the Goſpel in foreign parts, are deſired to inform the Public, in their enſuing annual abſtract of the Proceedings of the Society, whether the following article of news, which was printed in one of the daily papers, Aug. 31, 1769, is true?

Feb. 26, 1770.

Extract of a letter from Halifax, in Nova Scotia; dated July 6, 1769.

"The Popiſh Prieſt, who was ordained at "Quebec, by a Biſhop of the Church of Rome, is "now appointed by *Government* as a Miſſionary in "this Province; and has obtained, by means of "his good friends on your ſide of the water, a "ſalary of *one hundred pounds ſterling* ſettled upon "him during life. He is very active in his profeſ- "ſion, celebrates Maſs, and many perſons flock "to confeſſion. He has already made *many Con-* "*verts*. As a convincing proof of his aſſiduity in "office, ſeveral children, who were baptized by "Proteſtant Miſſionaries, have been *rebaptized by* "*him* into the Holy Church," &c.

To

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *March* 8, 1770.

BE pleaſed to inſert in your Paper the following anſwer to a letter ſigned *Cantabrigienſis*, which appeared in your Chronicle on the 22d of laſt month.

Yours, &c.

A. B.

To CANTABRIGIENSIS.

THOUGH in common with many others you greatly miſtake Archbiſhop Secker's real character, yet you write with more decency and coolneſs, than the reſt of his adverſaries, and deſerve an anſwer. When I aſſerted that *his Grace remonſtrated ſtrenuouſly and repeatedly againſt the meaſure in queſtion*, I did not ſay, that theſe remonſtrances were made *before* Mr. Brionne's departure, that is (according to your intelligence) before the Archbiſhop knew any thing of the matter. All that can be fairly collected from my words is, that whenever his Grace *did* know what was going forwards, whether *before* or *after* the man's embarkation, *then* he made his remonſtrances. This is what I meant to affirm, what I ſtill affirm, and what I know to be true. And I can further inform you, that when this perſon was actually gone,

gone, the Miniſters aſſured the Archbiſhop, that he went without their conſent or approbation, and without any authority to exerciſe his functions at Quebec. How far this account of the matter was true or defenſible, is beſt known to themſelves. Poſſibly they might think that this man's requeſt could neither be prudently granted, nor yet abſolutely refuſed, conſiſtently with the ſixth article of the capitulation of Quebec, or the fourth article of the Peace of Paris; and that therefore all they had left was, to ſay nothing, and let him take his own courſe at his own peril.

But for all this, (you ſay) *there is no better evidence than the word of a nameleſs Academic.* This evidence is as good as *a nameleſs Objector* has any right to demand. But there are ſeveral others beſides myſelf who have the beſt authority for this fact, and if it ſhould ever be neceſſary, will openly bear this teſtimony to it. In the mean while if you deſire better evidence, apply to thoſe who had then the management of affairs, and you will be quickly ſatisfied that *Academicus* was not miſinformed.

What you mean by *a clandeſtine remonſtrance* I do not well underſtand. The remonſtrance of one great man to another muſt in its nature be a private tranſaction. Such a public one as you recommend, the occaſion ſurely did not call for. There were manifeſt reaſons of propriety and decency againſt it, beſides the difficulties that might ariſe from the treaties above-mentioned.

The paragraph in the Daily Gazetteer of April 26, 1766, was generally ſuppoſed (you ſay) *to come from the Surry ſide of the Thames.* But you may be aſ-

ſured

ſured that there were no grounds for that *ſuppoſition*, nor for a multitude of others which have been and are every day made concerning Archbiſhop Secker. It is quite aſtoniſhing that men of ſenſe and virtue can allow themſelves to go on thus *everlaſtingly ſuppoſing* whatever they pleaſe, in prejudice of a dead man whom they happen to diſlike, and then argue on their own imaginations as acknowledged facts; without ever once reflecting on the manifeſt injuſtice and cruelty of ſuch a proceeding.

The *inoffenſiveneſs* of Popiſh Biſhops in England, urged by his Grace in his anſwer to Dr. Mayhew, and alluded to by you, has been ſo often canvaſſed and ſo ſatisfactorily explained, that it is high time to have done with it. It was evidently mentioned by his Grace as a mere matter of fact, without any mark of approbation. The thing itſelf is notorious, and if it ought to be rectified, it is the *Civil* Magiſtrate muſt interfere, not the *Eccleſiaſtical*. If the former chuſes to connive at theſe practices, the latter has no power to prevent it. If *ſome ſerious Proteſtants think that the Popiſh Biſhops have done, and are ſtill doing ſubſtantial miſchief*, there are many other Proteſtants no leſs ſerious, and, I believe, much better informed, who think otherwiſe. But be that miſchief what it will, it was not greater in Archbiſhop Secker's time than before or ſince. He took all proper precautions to prevent the growth of Popery, both in the kingdom at large, and *in his own peculiar flock*; and there is not the leaſt reaſon to believe that it gained ground during his adminiſtration.

You aſſert, *that all the annual harangues in a certain Society, were attuned to his key.* This is

another

another gratuitous ſuppoſition. He ſeldom, if ever, either heard or ſaw thoſe harangues till they were preached or printed. And in ſome of them there were paſſages which he by no means approved.

Your concluding fact, *that on the 17th of February 1769, not one Miſſionary was employed in the whole province of Canada*, may poſſibly be true, but is not to the point. The Society has nothing to do with Canada, nor are its funds equal to the care of ſo large a territory. The Government took upon itſelf ſolely and abſolutely the ſettlement of Eccleſiaſtical Affairs in that Country, and agreed long ago to ſend three Proteſtant Miſſionaries there, one to each of the three diſtricts into which Canada is divided, *Quebec*, *Montreal*, and *Trois Rivieres*. If thoſe Miſſionaries are not already gone, it is to be hoped they will ſoon. If not, let the blame fall where it ought. It affects not the Society, which has no concern with Canada, and ſtill leſs with Archbiſhop Secker, who died in 1768; and whilſt he lived, never ceaſed importuning the Miniſter to eſtabliſh a proper number of Proteſtant Clergymen in thoſe Provinces.

ACADEMICUS.

March 24, 1770.

For the LONDON CHRONICLE.

On the late Archbiſhop of Canterbury's letter, printed in the London Chronicle, No. 1956.

THIS letter of the late Archbiſhop's ſeems to me to have more in it of the Politician than the Divine, both in the matter and addreſs, and *not* to contain in it a full and impartial repreſentation of the caſe.

To the honour of the American Proteſtants be it ſpoken, they are too well acquainted with the nature of religious and civil liberty to wiſh, or to endeavour, that any of their diſſenting brethren ſhould be debarred of any privilege, religious or civil, that belongs to themſelves. The American ſchools, academies, offices, are alike open to *all*, and not even a compulſory ſhilling that I can find, is taken from any for the maintenance and ſupport of any Paſtors, or places of worſhip, but of their own choice. It is certain all are equally free as fellow chriſtians and fellow ſubjects. How diffe-rent is this ſtate of things from the caſe of thoſe of their brethren on this ſide of the Atlantic? And how long it would be their lot on the other, who can ſay, if a Society inſtituted for propagating the Goſpel, and an alliance of church with ſtate power, ſhall be ſo much inclined, and continue to bend

their forces againſt them—To *degrade* ſuch who will not comply with *human eſtabliſhments* and impoſitions, and put badges of *inferiority* and marks of *diſgrace* on thoſe who are *alike* good Chriſtians and ſubjects with their neighbours? The Biſhop does the Diſſenters here the honour to acknowledge that they are ſincere well-wiſhers to the civil part of our preſent happy eſtabliſhment, and are to be eſteemed and commended for it—[I will preſume to add as a natural unavoidable conſequence, ought not to be put under an *incapacity* of enjoying civil privileges] but not to be *gratified*, he adds, at the expence of thoſe who wiſh well to both parts—moſt certainly juſt—moſt ſoftly expreſſed. They are to be gratified in nothing but the enjoyment of the ſame chriſtian liberty and civil right with thoſe who diſſent from them—and whoever denies that to another, be it *here* or *there*, I ſhall not ſcruple to ſay, not only breaks the Golden Rule, but does as much as he can to forfeit any juſt right or favour he might otherwiſe claim for himſelf—Here then let the matter ſtand—By *this* be it tried. Church power claiming an alliance with the ſtate, to the prejudice of all non-compliers, is the *thing* that fills with dread; their fathers and brethren have ſuffered by theſe means—This *allied power* is ſtill *claimed*, and is made to paſs under the cover of Propagating the Goſpel.—Whilſt then this is the caſe, it is in vain to throw a veil, or to think by ſoft words to divert the attention from real facts and probable conſequences. Let us have *principles* fixed on the baſis of *religious* and *civil liberty*, on which *all good chriſtians and ſubjects ſhall alike* ſtand firm—Difficulties and ſuſpicions would be

diſ-

diſſolved with the fabric of *church power*, but whilſt the *latter* ſtands entwiſted with the ſtate, and has deprived my neighbour of rights that originally belonged to him, how ſhall I be ſecure that my houſe ſhall not ſuffer from the ſame cauſes when a Land ſhall ariſe and try to have power exerted to the utmoſt—The Biſhop is indeed pleaſed to think there is a great alteration, in the ſentiments of the Clergy within thirty years paſt, which is readily granted, and to the honour of thoſe, in whom this alteration is made, be it ſpoken; but if the Biſhop had been alive, I would have aſked him what *public effect* as to *liberty* ſince, and if *none*, how can that be accounted for? At whoſe door muſt that be laid? And as he in particular ſtiles himſelf in this letter A Lover of Religious Liberty, I would have aſked what *one public* inſtance he had given of his regard thereto, ſince he had been in his exalted ſtation?

As to the thing pleaded for in this letter, conſidered in itſelf, or a religious view only, it ſurely had need be of ſome conſequence to go ſo far on pilgrimage for it.—The Jews, when they went up thrice a year to Jeruſalem, had a plain direction, and as plain a promiſe of protection and bleſſing in the way of their duty; but where is the plain direction for an *Epiſcopal Confirming Hand*, capable of beſtowing *ſuch gifts*, or the *peculiar ſanctity* of their ordaining *one?* Is not *that* too much covered with *doubtful diſputations* to afford light and comfort to Chriſtians as ſuch in ſo long a pilgrimage for one or other—but of this the voyagers muſt judge for themſelves, and to their conſciences I ſubmit it.

I muſt confeſs, I cannot help thinking, that the Biſhop ſhould ſuppoſe his hand could confer the *gifts of the Holy Ghoſt* from the practice and example of the *apoſtolic laying on of hands*, ſeems an article of *faith* unworthy the deep head of a Secker; and the *neceſſity* of an epiſcopal ordination in order to render chriſtian inſtitutes *valid*, ſeems as much below the *charity* of ſo enlightened a Prelate. Such pleas might indeed quicken the motives to a voyage; but would it not then be the very high church that the Biſhop does not ſeem to approve in this letter? To go lower, and merely to think Epiſcopal better or more regular where it conveniently could be had, whilſt others were ſtill ſuppoſed Miniſters of Chriſt, and as ſuch accounted and treated; would it not on the other hand ſlacken the motives, make it matter of leſs conſequence, more charity, and leſs ſtriſe.—However be the grounds of his faith, and the extent of his charity what it might—let him not have gone, or ſent, over with ſtate and church power to lord it over others (againſt which mankind can never be too much on their guard) but ſimply to lay his hand on a child's head, and if he could have pleaſed himſelf that any gifts were thereby beſtowed, or that ordination from Biſhop Secker would give a whit more *virtue*, or be of more ſervice to *religion*, than when given by Dr. Secker, I ſhould more heartily have wiſhed, that at the ſame time others were rendered happy and ſafe in the full enjoyment of their liberty, that he and his friends had been all happy together, and been in full poſſeſſion of every thing that might have rendered

what

what he here terms the exerciſe of their religion compleat. I am,

Your humble ſervant,

A M.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *March* 29, 1770.

A WRITER in your Chronicle of *March* 8, who ſtiles himſelf *Academicus*, tells his opponent, that "The ſociety [for propagating the "goſpel in foreign parts] has nothing to do with "*Canada*."—If this is true, I cannot ſee the propriety of their concerning themſelves with the *religion* of the *Canadians* in any reſpect. And yet in the abſtract of the ſociety's proceedings ſubjoined to Dr. *Newton*'s ſermon, preached *Feb.* 17, 1769, we have an article importing, that "by a letter "from the Rev. Mr. *Chabrand Deliſle*, Chaplain "to the garriſon at *Montreal*, the ſociety is in-"formed of the neglected ſtate of the church of "*England* in thoſe parts, of which the Romiſh "prieſts avail themſelves greatly, perſuading the "*Canadians* (who are moſt eaſily to be perſuaded, "being a moſt ignorant bigotted people, and en-"tirely devoted to the prieſts, eſpecially the je-"ſuits) that *we* have not religion ſo much at "heart as *they*. The ſaid Mr. *Deliſle*, being deſti-"tute of a place of public worſhip, he is forced to "perform in the hoſpital chapel."

But

But what is all this to the ſociety, if the ſociety has nothing to do with *Canada?* and if, as *Academicus* aſſures us, "The government took upon "it *ſolely* and *abſolutely* the ſettlement of eccleſi-"aſtical affairs in that country, and agreed *long* "*ago* to ſend three proteſtant miſſionaries there, "one to each of the three diſtricts into which "*Canada* is divided, *Quebec*, *Montreal*, and *Trois* "*Rivieres*."

If therefore the church of England is neglected in thoſe parts ever ſo much, Mr. *Deliſle*'s account cannot *wring the withers* of the ſociety, and if he knew the ſtate of the caſe as given by *Academicus*, was it not impertinent in him to ſend his complaint to the ſociety? And indeed why ſhould the ſociety publiſh the letter, unleſs by way of libel upon the miniſter, whom, according to *Academicus*, "Archbiſhop *Secker* never ceaſed importu-"ning to eſtabliſh a proper number of proteſtant "clergymen in thoſe provinces?"

I hope *Academicus* will not be backward to reconcile theſe appearances to the idea we have been taught to entertain of the zeal and conſiſtency of this honourable ſociety. And while he is doing this, it might not be amiſs, (as he ſeems to be intimately acquainted with the utmoſt extent of the venerable ſociety's obligations) to inform us, whether the ſociety hath or hath not *any thing to do* with the province of *Halifax* in *Nova Scotia?*

Our public prints have announced "a popiſh "prieſt, appointed a miſſionary in that province, "who has obtained, by means of his good friends "on this ſide the water, a ſalary of 100l. ſterling "ſettled upon him during life. He is farther re-

"pre-

" preſented to have made many converts, and it " is given, as a convincing proof of his aſſiduity " in office, that ſeveral children, who were bap- " tized by proteſtant miſſionaries, have been re- " baptized by him into the holy church, &c."

A queſtion has been put to the honourable ſociety, in *one* (perhaps in *more*) of our daily papers, whether this article of news is true? And it is to be hoped the ſociety in their abſtract for this year will anſwer it, as *deſired*.

It will be to no purpoſe to depute *Academicus* to anſwer for them, that " the popiſh prieſt is ap- " pointed by government," as the news-paper ſays, and that conſequently the ſociety " has no- " thing to do with *Nova Scotia*." The ſociety, according to him, has nothing to do with *Canada*; and yet hath condeſcended to give us an account of the *propagation of the goſpel* in thoſe parts. And the Queriſt in the other news-paper is, I dare ſay, perſuaded on very good grounds, that the ſociety is able, by means of ſome or other of its correſpondents, to procure intelligence from *Nova Scotia*, equally authentic with that from *Montreal*.

The ſociety indeed ſeems to me to be conſcious that its obligations are not ſo limited as *Academicus* would repreſent them. Their charter impowers them to diſtribute their edification to *all* our Britiſh colonies, nor, as far as I can learn from their abſtracts, is there one of them with which the ſociety thinks it *hath nothing to do*. One principal view of their charter is to counteract the popiſh prieſts and jeſuits, who, for want of orthodox miniſters to inſtruct the Britiſh ſubjects in the colonies, " are encouraged (ſays the charter) to

" pervert and draw over our ſaid loving ſubjects " to popiſh ſuperſtition and idolatry ;" the very caſe exhibited by the honeſt and worthy Mr. *Deliſle*.

Academicus therefore muſt excuſe me, for not believing that the honourable and venerable ſociety, compoſed as it is, would be guilty of ſo flagrant a breach of truſt, as to leave the ſettlement of eccleſiaſtical affairs in any Britiſh colony, ſo *ſolely* or ſo *abſolutely* to one or more miniſters of ſtate, as to exclude themſelves from having *any thing to do in it*. It is a ſuppoſition founded upon no new caſe, that miniſters of ſtate may be popiſhly affected, and under the pretence of *political neceſſity*, may countenance meaſures which tend to ſap the very foundations of our proteſtant conſtitution ; and for this purpoſe, no implements ſo proper as popiſh prieſts and jeſuits. A miniſter of ſtate with theſe views, would very naturally begin with trying what he could make of the colonies. If his attempts there met with no oppoſition, he would try in the next place the patience of the mother country. Forbid it heaven that any ſuſpicions of this kind ſhould fall upon our preſent upright miniſters ; but facts of the ſort abovementioned, however they are to be accounted for, have an ugly appearance, and the vigilance of the ſociety on all ſuch occaſions heretofore, convinces me, that *Academicus* groſsly ſlanders that venerable body, by affirming that it *hath nothing to do* with *Canada*. And I think there cannot be a more direct proof of it than what he himſelf hath given, namely, that Archbiſhop *Secker*, then at the head, and as uſed to be ſaid, the very life and ſoul of the

the ſociety, was ſo far from thinking that the miniſters of ſtate were *ſolely* and *abſolutely* entruſted with the ſettlement of eccleſiaſtical affairs in *Canada*, that he never ceaſed interpoſing his own weight in a caſe, where he could not but perceive he had no buſineſs, if *Academicus* deſerves any regard.

I am,

SIR, *&c.*

OLD ELLIOT.

LONDON CHRONICLE, *April* 10, 1770.

To ACADEMICUS.

I AM obliged to you for your anſwer, ſuch as it is, and have only to regret that you ſhould not think me *deſerving* of one more ſatisfactory to the public.

Alas! Sir, it was not I who ſpoiled your aſſertion on the behalf of Archbiſhop *Secker*. It was *Cantianus*. It is with *him*, that you have the *affair of honour*. It was *he* that reduced you to the ſubterfuge of, *Whether before or after*. But, in troth I think you are almoſt even with him, by appealing to the 6th article of the capitulation of *Quebec*, and the 4th of the peace of *Paris*: From which, it ſeems, the deſignation of a popiſh Biſhop

for *Quebec* might have been ſmelled out long before his Grace's information at *Dover*.—But perhaps his Grace knew nothing of any ſuch articles, till Monſieur *L'Eveque* had given him the *go-by*.

The credit of a *nameleſs Objector* is, I think, remarkably diſtinguiſhed, on the preſent occaſion, from that of a *nameleſs Academic*, by ſome ſtriking circumſtances. The *Objector*'s place of abode is marked by this ſignature, and the name even of the individual may, I believe, be had by enquiring at a principal coffee-houſe in the town. Whereas we may have half the univerſities in Europe to ranſack, before we can have a chance of meeting with the *Academicus* of the *London Chronicle*.

Indeed, you have ſaved us the trouble of looking for you in any of the eſtabliſhed ſeminaries of Great Britain or Ireland, by freely owning that, *the occaſion* (the allowing a popiſh Biſhop at *Quebec*) *did not call for a public remonſtrance* from our proteſtant paſtors, even when it was found that a *private* one from the chief of them had been diſregarded; becauſe (as you ſignify afterwards) popiſh Biſhops, neither *have done* nor *are doing* any *ſubſtantial miſchief* at home.

You direct me, "to apply to thoſe who had "THEN the management of affairs." *Then*, Sir? *When* do you mean? Pleaſe to fix the *time*, whether *before* or *after*, before you ſend us to *perſons* and *places*. From the capitulation of *Quebec* to the expedition of Monſieur *Brionne* from Dover, is a period of ſome length; during which, if I miſtake not, *the management of affairs* was in various hands. Is it a conduct worthy of a defender of Archbiſhop *Secker* to call for a *negative* proof, while

while you have the *beſt poſitive authority for the fact?* Trifle no longer, dear Sir; produce your evidence at once, and confound *Cantianus* and *Cantabrigienſis* with the ſame ſtroke of your pen.

This point being cleared, the way will be more open to you to anſwer what remains of the diſpute, concerning the late Archbiſhop's zeal and endeavours againſt popery—concerning annual harangues in a certain ſociety—and concerning the want of proteſtant miſſionaries in *Canada*. You may then proceed to *explain* the *inoffenſiveneſs* of popiſh Biſhops, to mean ſomething beſides their *doing no ſubſtantial miſchief* among a proteſtant people. And when you have given us *ſubſtantial* reaſons to be of the ſame mind herein with many proteſtants *no leſs ſerious than yourſelf*, it will *then*, and not *before*, be high *time to have done with the ſubject*.

One word more, Sir, in your ear, and I have done. If a certain plan for propagating chriſtianity propoſed in *North America* (the diſappointment of which was *vindicated*, if not *occaſioned*, by a certain Prelate) had taken place, *Canada* would not have been without more proteſtant miſſionaries than one long before 1768.

CANTABRIGIENSIS.

March 15, 1770.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *May* 1, 1770.

IN peruſing the trial of *Mungo Campbel*, for the murder of Lord *Eglingtoun*, I obſerved a piece of evidence, on which I could not find his council had laid ſufficient ſtreſs, and which, being properly laid before an Engliſh jury, would, in my opinion, have acquitted that unhappy man, on the principle of *Self-defence*. It is in the 45th page of the printed trial, and is part of the depoſition of *John Hazle*, ſervant to Lord *Eglingtoun*, in the following words:

" That the Pannel having kicked his heel againſt " a ſtone, fell backwards, and the gun flew up, " and his heels flew up. That the Earl upon that " *did not advance*, but *ſtood ſtill* and ſmiled; after " which the Pannel raiſed himſelf, leaned upon " his right elbow, and then levelled his gun at my " Lord's body, *and then ſtopped ſome time; and my* " *Lord was proceeding to go round the Pannel's feet* " *towards his head, as he* [the deponent] *thinks;* " and was about a yard and a half or two yards " from the muzzle of the gun, and *he ſaw the* " *Pannel point the gun at my Lord*, and ſaw the " gun fired into my Lord's body, but did not ob- " ſerve whether the Pannel's finger was upon the " trigger or not."

I think my Lord's Council admit, that his Lordſhip had no right to ſeize *Campbel*'s gun in the place where

where *Campbel* fell; and they conſider the taking of the gun [if it had been taken] as a *treſpaſs*, for which *Campbel* might have had his remedy againſt his Lordſhip, at law. How the law ſtands in Scotland with reſpect to ſuch a caſe, I do not pretend to know; but this I know, that an attempt to take a man's property from him by force *in a certain open place, in or near the King's highway*, is called, by the law of England, *an aſſault, with an intent to rob;* and it conſiders the perſon ſo attacked, as having a right to defend himſelf and his property, even at the expence of the life of the *aſſaulter*. That Lord Eglingtoun *intended* to take *Campbel*'s gun *by force*, there is no room to doubt. His Lordſhip demands it. It is refuſed. The poſſeſſor retreats; his Lordſhip purſues him, and the conſequence is, as above-related by *Hazle*.

By this man's evidence, *Campbel* is fully acquitted of all *premeditated deſign* to take his Lordſhip's life. While he could ſecure his property by retreating, he forbears to ſhoot: after my Lord ceaſed to advance upon *Campbel* when he was down, and could no longer retreat, how does *Campbel* behave? He keeps himſelf indeed in a poſture of defence, but *there he ſtopped ſome time*, that is to ſay, till my Lord *proceeded to go round his feet towards his head*, till his Lordſhip, in other words, *repeated the aſſault*, which *Campbel*, in the ſituation he was in, had no other means of repelling, but by diſcharging his piece. *Hazle*'s depoſition plainly diſtinguiſhes between Campbel's *levelling his gun at my Lord's body*, and his *pointing the gun at my Lord*. They are two different actions. An interval of time paſſes between them, and the gun, though

levelled,

levelled, is not *pointed*, till my Lord repeats the aſſault.

I declare I have no intention to reflect upon *Campbel*'s Judges or his Jury. I doubt not but they were determined by the law of their country as they underſtood it (underſtanding it however, perhaps in its utmoſt rigour) I only ſubmit it, whether upon *this* evidence, an upright Engliſh Judge would not have directed the Jury to *acquit* the priſoner? and whether an impartial Engliſh Jury would not have taken thoſe directions?

I am, *&c.*

AN INDEPENDENT SCOT.

P. S. I have lived in England upwards of forty years, in an office which has obliged me frequently to attend criminal examinations. And it has often occurred to me, that if the Seſſions Books gave a more circumſtantial account of the evidence in capital caſes, and of the directions given by the Court to the Jury, upon which the acquittal or condemnation of the priſoner, may frequently depend, it might not only be of general uſe, but encourage proſecutors to bring all villains to juſtice, who, I am ſatisfied, often eſcape through the ignorance of the proſecutor, either how to lay his charge, or through a perſuaſion that the offence is not within the reach of legal puniſhment. I am frequently at a loſs to find out by the book, why priſoners have been acquitted or condemned reſpectively, upon evidence, in which I could ſcarcely perceive any circumſtance of difference, with reſpect to the proof of the facts. This information ſeems to be the more ſeaſonable at this time, on ac-

account of the murders, robberies, burglaries, &c. which at this period are become ſo common and alarming.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *June* 9, 1770.

I Think it is generally agreed that no act of a man in durance, or under the conſtraint of impriſonment, ſhall be valid either againſt his life or his property, if that act be done with a view to procure his liberty. For what will not a man do to reſcue himſelf from a ſtate of miſery and confinement in a loathſome habitation, and diſagreeable company, in order to be at liberty to employ and ſubſiſt himſelf in ſome reputable calling to which his talents and inclination freely diſpoſe him. The furious High Churchmen, and the bigotted Methodiſts of the preſent generation, are for ever upbraiding their more moderate brethren, with contravening their ſubſcriptions to certain creeds, articles, homilies and forms of prayer, with as little juſtice or propriety, as a creditor would reproach a debtor with breach of contract, who on the condition of giving him his liberty, ſhould execute a bond for ten thouſand pounds, while he was yet in gaol, and known not to be worth one thouſand farthings.

Every ſubſcription to eſtabliſhed forms, is exacted from the candidate for an academical degree, for eccleſiaſtical orders, for a drudging curacy, or for

for a more lucrative benefice, under the circumſtances of mental bondage, and the terror of living in poverty and diſgrace, if he does not comply with his unmerciful taſk-maſters in this article of ſubſcription.

If it is ſaid, the Candidate is under no conſtraint in the matter of ſubſcription, but may let it alone if he will; I anſwer, no more is the miſerable debtor, any farther than the human affections and ſenſibilities lead him to prefer a life of liberty and reaſonable accommodations, to the walls of a priſon, and the ſcanty pittances that are to be procured by the produce of the begging box, to which indeed many a worthy, honeſt, and learned man might be literally reduced, if, after ſpending his whole fortune in an academical education, even perhaps to the laſt farthing, his liberal ſentiments, in favour of the paramount authority of ſcripture truth, ſhould diſpoſe him to refuſe his ſubſcription to the precarious ſenſe, which ſome fallible, but highly preſumptuous, mortals, equipped with a little brief authority, have contrived to put upon it. Extinguiſh the human affections and ſenſibilities in ſuch a ſubſcriber, and I will freely allow you to abuſe him for his compliance with an arbitrary condition of gaining a decent livelihood, where he had no temptation.

That wretched Charlatan in divinity, who propoſed a while ago, for an alternative of ſubſcription, that the ſcrupulous candidate ſhould apply himſelf to ſome other way of getting a livelihood, ought to have been immediately ſent, with a mattock and a ſpade, to work for ſix months in the lead mines of his native country; after which, poſſibly, he

he might be permitted to return to his theological trappings, as he would then have a clearer conception, from experience, of the juſtice and charity of his alternative.

His idea, however, that ſubſcription is one way of getting a livelihood, is not quite ſo far out of the road. No man in the kingdom is better acquainted with its operation this way than himſelf, and for my own part, I do not ſee (as ſubſcription is made by law an indiſpenſible condition of getting a livelihood one way) why any man, who has neither means, abilities, nor inclination to get a livelihood in any way where ſubſcription is not a condition, ſhould ſcruple to avail himſelf of that way, any more than the above-mentioned Mountebank. I ſay, in any way where ſubſcription is not a condition, for the liberal profeſſions of Phyſic and Civil Law are equally ſhut up by ſubſcription as that of Divinity, if the practitioner is to enter upon them with the regularity of academical degrees and canonical admiſſion.

Figure to yourſelf, Mr. Printer, a young man who has ſpent ſeventeen or eighteen years at ſchool and college, with an expreſs view of officiating as a pariſh Miniſter, honoured with the ampleſt teſtimony of his proficiency in learning, in virtue, in piety, in good manners, with an earneſt inclination to undertake the duty, and a firm reſolution to fulfil it; his fortune, or a very great part of it, gone in the expenſive articles of an academical life, and his conſtitution not unimpaired by an intenſe application.—Figure, I ſay, to yourſelf ſuch a one, at the very eve of his accompliſhing his laudable purpoſe, contemplating an obſtruction thrown

thrown in his way by a ſubſcription, which neither his head nor his heart will permit him to approve.* Can you conceive a more appoſite compariſon of the ſtate of ſuch a man, than that of an honeſt tradeſman, who having laboured with art and induſtry in hope of providing a decent competency for himſelf and family, finds himſelf incumbered with an unfortunate circumſtance, which, without any fault of his own, hurries him to gaol, and cuts off all his hopes of future proſperity? The laws of man allow ſuch a one to diſable his own act, if it is obtained either through the fear of his bondage being continued, or the hope of a ſpeedy releaſement, the act itſelf being otherwiſe iniquitous, unjuſt, or even unreaſonable: And ſhall nothing be allowed to the much harder caſe of the paſtoral candidate?

It is true, the validity of the act of ſubſcription, is to be tried *in foro interno*. But ſhall we ſay, that the laws of God are leſs equitable or merciful than the laws of men? Doth not the Creator of man know *whereof he is made*, as well as the creators of the laws of men? And will the Judge of all the Earth puniſh, where the law of man would acquit, on that gracious principle of compaſſion to human infirmity and human neceſſity, which he himſelf ſo expreſly inculcates? Human law conſiders the act of ſubſcription, not as a conſcientious, but merely as a civil ſecurity for the enjoyment of the ſubſcriber's ſtation and emoluments in the church. As ſuch, and as ſuch only, the Magiſtrate im-

* This caſe has ſince been *realized* in the Univerſity of Cambridge. See in the Whitehall Evening Poſt, Aug. 12, 1773, No. xii of *Every Man his own Prieſt*.

impoſes it and receives it: and all the equitable world beſides muſt conſider it as under an abſolute inability to oblige *in foro interno*, where it interferes with the word of God, which in all Proteſtant communities muſt have its ſovereignty reſerved to it either by a poſitive or an implied condition.

I ſcruple not therefore to affirm, that all ſubſcriptions, obtained in the circumſtances above deſcribed, are as equally null and void, *in foro interno*, as any act obtained from a debtor or a culprit in durance, is null and void, *in foro externo*. The methodiſtical champions, inſtead of venting their malicious and ſplenetic abuſe againſt the ſubſcribing clergy who do not think as they do, ſhould ſpend their indignation upon thoſe who bind them to theſe iniquitous and oppreſſive ſecurities, and, callous to all reaſonable and ſcriptural conſiderations, obſtinately refuſe to relieve them from it. Let us look forward to another world. Will God acquit thoſe at the final judgment, who, by thus enſnaring their brethren, not only obſtruct the free courſe of the word of God, but uſurp his place, in preſcribing for doctrines the commandments of men? Will he not rather have mercy on thoſe who comply in this one act againſt their judgment, to humour the civil magiſtrate, but are found faithful in the ſubſtantial parts of their duty? If the phariſaical impoſers are found among the goats, let the leaders of the cry in theſe bands of methodiſm take heed, that they be not conſigned to bear them company as the beam-blinking accuſers of the brethren.

I am, &c.

SAVANAROLA.

ST. JAMES'S CHRONICLE, *June* 12, 1770.

To the PRINTER.

SIR,

YOUR correſpondent, who in your Chronicle of June 5, ſigns himſelf *Candor*, cannot object to your pointing out or publiſhing the letters in which thoſe of Dr. *Secker*, ſigned *Miſopſeudes*, were criticiſed and anſwered. If I remember right, the character of Biſhop *Butler* was by no means cleared of its popiſh hue by the letters of *Miſopſeudes*, who was ſo followed up by his antagoniſt, that the cauſe grew worſe and worſe in the Archbiſhop's hands, to the great vexation of ſome of his friends, who were very ſenſible that his Grace's operations in the news-papers had no better effect than to purchaſe him the mortification of being worſted by one, who in thoſe days was known to be a poor Curate within a few miles of his Grace's palace, and who covered his march ſo well, that not one of his Grace's terriers could come within ſcent of him. If then, Mr. Baldwin, you think proper to publiſh his Grace's apologies for Biſhop *Butler*, to oblige Mr. *Candor*, pleaſe to publiſh the indictment and the rejoinders, to oblige me and the public.

The other circumſtance mentioned by *Candor* is ſtill more delicate, and as the biographers have given

given him the cue of enquiry, it is hoped they will gratify his curioſity. But I dare ſay, we have heard as much of Archbiſhop *Secker* from theſe Gentlemen as they deſign we ſhall. The picture, at preſent, is well plaſtered with a compoſition which covers a multitude of blemiſhes. Time, however, is a great developer, and in due ſeaſon may produce a life of Archbiſhop *Secker*, when *Candor* may contemplate his Grace's features in an exhibition, where the portrait will be finiſhed with more preciſion.

I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

DUSKY TRUTH.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *July* 19, 1770.

THOUGH I am no clerk, and conſequently not under the terror of the black books, reprimands, and viſitatorial enquiries, with which your correſpondent *Euſebius* would intimidate his brethren, I cannot but lament, that the ſpirit of the late Primate ſhould ſo ſuddenly have taken poſſeſſion of his ſurvivors, at leaſt if the intelligence we have from the ſaid *Euſebius* is well grounded.

As

As many of the high-church clergy were, at the firſt, apt to conſider the late Arch-Prelate as a kind of interloper, it was natural enough for him to endeavour to conciliate their minds, and to ſtifle their diſcontents at his promotion, by a practice which would convince them that he was theirs upon principle, even to the extremity of their higheſt flights. The artifice took, and he became the idol of every tory churchman, and every intolerant bigot of the Caſſock, for the laſt ten or twelve years of his reign.

With all this, he had the dexterity to cajole the diſſenters, ſo far as to draw in ſome of the heads of them to connive at, and one or two of them to favour, his moſt pernicious ſcheme of prelatiſing America; if he himſelf at leaſt ſpeaks the truth, in a certain poſthumous pamphlet.

But what occaſion have our preſent fathers on the bench for theſe ſilly expedients? Moſt of them have aſcended regularly by the forms of the eſtabliſhment, to their preſent exaltation. Many of them, in the earlier part of their lives, have appeared publicly to be men of liberal minds, generous principles, and friends to religious liberty. Can it be of any benefit to the chriſtian cauſe, or any ornament to their own reputation, to tread in the ſteps of a man, whoſe eſtimation with a contemptible party, depended upon his ſuppreſſing, on the one hand, all freedom of enquiry into religious ſubjects, and all documents tending to a farther reformation; and, on the other, to ſtifle all memorials of his own obnoxious beginnings?

Euſebius, I hope, only ſpeaks from his own wiſhes, and not from matter of fact. Our preſent

Pre-

Prelates, I truſt, are men of integrity, who have no occaſion for ſubterfuges and diſguiſes to ſcreen their defection from good principles, either in religion or politics. They have ſenſe enough to perceive the wretched ſucceſs of their predeceſſor's duplicity, the ill ſavour of his memory, and in what low eſteem all his tools are at this hour, with every man of ſenſe, and every friend to the civil and religious rights of Engliſhmen and proteſtants.

Conſcious of this, the wretched *Euſebius* endeavours to fix the ſame inquiſitorial ſpirit upon our preſent venerable paſtors. And as he himſelf was moſt probably one of the late Archbiſhop's implements, and that perhaps in the mean department of furniſhing contents for the black book, he finds no alternative, but either to ſuffer by a compariſon with the honeſt and candid of his own profeſſion, or to make the moſt reſpectable of the order as black and dirty as himſelf and his late patron.

MISOPHARISÆUS.

LONDON CHRONICLE, *Sept.* 11, 1770.

To the PRINTER.

SIR,

TYRO-PHILELEUTHERUS, in an evening paper of Auguſt 25, is pleaſed to ſay, that, in his *Addreſs to the rational Advocates of the Church*

Church of England, a paſſage there mentioned, " does not refer to a reſponſibility for the non-" performance of the conditions impoſed upon the " clergy, but expreſsly and literally to a reſpon-" ſibility for the *impropriety alone* of impoſing " them."

The paſſage in queſtion is *literally* and *expreſsly* this: " For the impropriety of thoſe conditions " which theſe clergymen may not entirely approve " of, as they had no hand in framing or impoſing " them, they do not think themſelves reſpon-" ſible."

Is it not clear that the *reſponſibility* in this paſſage refers to the *impropriety of the conditions themſelves*, and neither *alone* nor *at all* to the *impropriety of impoſing them?*

The impropriety of the conditions impoſed, and the impropriety of impoſing them, are different things. There may be an impropriety in *impoſing* conditions, which are neither improper nor inequitable in themſelves. By ſaying, in ſuch a caſe, after I have ſubmitted to equitable conditions, that I am not reſponſible for the impropriety of *impoſing* them, I derogate nothing from the obligation to perform the conditions themſelves. But by ſaying that I do not think myſelf reſponſible for the impropriety of the conditions themſelves, even after I have ſubmitted to them, I muſt either mean to get rid of the obligation to perform them, or my words will have no meaning at all.

I do not think the worthy and ingenious *Tyro-Philelutherus* at all more happy in his endeavours " to remove the odious charge of improper impo-

" ſitions

" ſitions from the venerable guardians of our " Church eſtabliſhment, and the Clergy in gene " ral," than he is in his apology for the *non-re ſponſibles*. As he ſtates the matter, theſe improper impoſitions are " a general misfortune, brought " upon the whole [*clerical*] profeſſion, through " the venial ſlips of a few well-meaning indivi- " duals." But whoever *brought* the misfortune *upon* the profeſſion, it is *continued* to this hour; and the queſtion is, upon whoſe ſhoulders is this *continuation* to be laid? Not upon the ſhoulders of the firſt injudicious impoſers, who knew no better, and whoſe ſlips were on that account venial. It muſt now, I am afraid, be transferred to the ſhoulders of their *leſs ingenuous modern advocates*, who are much more numerous than the *non-reſponſibles*, and whoſe pleas are too often authenticated by the venerable guardians of our church eſtabliſhment, to permit us with any degree of ſincerity to pay thoſe guardians compliments at the expence of our firſt reformers. It were to be wiſhed that they who are ſenſible of the iniquity as well as of the impropriety of religious impoſitions, would ſpeak out, and charge home the guilty and the callous without reſpect of perſons; and that they who expect this deference to their authority, would on *their* part bethink themſelves in time how they become intitled to it, conſider the future conſequences of upholding and encouraging uſurpations in the Church of God; and go and learn what that meaneth, *They that trouble you, ſhall bear their judgment whoever they be.* I am, SIR,

Yours, &c.

No indifferent Spectator.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Oct.* 2, 1770.

I HAVE been informed, on good authority, that a certain *Divine* in the Univerſity of Cambridge hath, for ſome time paſt, read *divinity lectures* in that place, to the ſatisfaction and with the entire approbation of many judicious and candid perſons both of that Univerſity and through the whole kingdom; but that he hath met with great oppoſition from ſome others, of whom better things might have been expected, and hath been repreſented to the higher powers as a promoter of *heretical* doctrines; for which, endeavours have been uſed to ſilence and even to bring him to puniſhment. How far it will redound to the honour of that learned body to be prevailed upon by ſuch ungenerous, illiberal and intereſted repreſentations of his enemies, to meditate any cenſures upon the worthy and ingenious Lecturer, or even to diſcontinue their encouragement of his laudable undertaking, the following ſtory may ſerve to ſhew——

Peter Baro had many friends in Cambridge of the greateſt eminence for learning and piety, ſome of whom were afterwards raiſed to the higheſt dignities in the church.—He for many years gave *public lectures*, in many points contrary to the notions

tions of Calvin.—In the year 1596, a formal complaint was made againſt him by ſome heads of colleges, to their Chancellor the great Lord Burleigh.—They received for anſwer from this moſt able and pious *Stateſman*, this ſevere and juſt reprimand, that, whatever were their opinions, "As "good and antient [perſons] were of another "judgment; that they might perhaps puniſh him, "but that would be for well doing."

HOADLEIANUS.

Wincheſter,
Sept. 29, 1770.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Oct.* 11, 1770.

HOADLEIANUS, in your Chronicle of the 2d inſtant, tells us, that "the worthy "Lecturer there mentioned, had met with great "oppoſition from ſome perſons of whom *better* "*things might have been expected,*" that is to ſay, *better things* than "repreſenting him to the higher "powers as a promoter of *heretical* doctrines, and "uſing endeavours to ſilence, and even to bring "him to puniſhment."

To what climate they belong who might have expected *better things* from theſe oppoſers, I cannot gueſs. The oppoſers have ſignalized themſelves, ſo far as I know, by nothing *better* than

ſophiſtical defences of eſtabliſhed impoſitions, and abject endeavours to ſtifle every thing which tends to encourage free enquiry, and to deliver the human mind from the bondage of blind ſyſtem, and ſcholaſtic determination; nor do I believe they ever raiſed expectations of any thing elſe.

There are among us, men who remember the time when the youth of this once venerable ſeminary were employed in ſomething more worthy the exerciſe of their talents, and the purſuits of the rational mind, than in acquiring accompliſhments which may be had at twenty private academies in and about London, with equal advantage, and at half the price they pay for them here. In thoſe days, I am told, there were leading characters among us, who valued themſelves upon profeſſing and encouraging the moſt liberal ſentiments upon civil and religious ſubjects, recommending and promoting thoſe ſtudies more eſpecially, which led their pupils to the juſteſt notions of religion and civil government, (the great ſources of ſublunary happineſs) and by conſequence, laid the beſt foundation for their fulfilling the important duties of good Chriſtians, and good Citizens.

This interval of good ſenſe, it ſeems, did not laſt long. *Patronage* fell into different hands, and that produced aſpirants of a different complexion, and from that period, in attachment to ſlaviſh opinions, in ſollicitude to keep down Freedom of Enquiry, in adulation of contemptible and even deteſtable characters, and in the cultivation of various frivoliſms, calculated to amuſe the inquiſitive turn of ſenſible and ingenuous young men, and to divert them from the ſerious purſuit of religious truth,

truth, and the principles of public liberty, we have outrivaled our ſuperlatively orthodox and obſequious ſiſter.

To retrieve the reputation of this ancient ſeat of good learning from the contempt, ridicule and odium of this complicated plan of ignorance, impoſture and venality, is, I apprehend, (for I have not the honour to be perſonally acquainted with him) the laudable view of this worthy Lecturer. May a bleſſing attend his labours, and may he live to ſee the comfortable fruits of them in a more generous and diſintereſted ſpirit exerting itſelf with warmth and vigour in the ſucceſſors of the *Fripons* and *Faineants* of the preſent generation.

I ſuſpect *Headleianus* may not be totally a ſtranger to the dirty intrigues of the jeſuitical clan, from whom he *might have expected better things*. He dates from a place where he may have authentic anecdotes. I hope he will favour us with ſome of them at a proper time. In the mean while, and for a ſpecimen of the proficiency of our preſent pupils, be pleaſed to accept the following hiſtorical fragment:

At a ſolemn, but private, conſultation, held not long ago, for the purpoſe of ſelecting a proper hand to vindicate our C—— from the ſatyrical ſtripes of the unmerciful *Junius*; (a ſervice, by the way, thought by many more than *the party*, to be indiſpenſably incumbent upon us) a long liſt of *hopefuls* was exhibited, not one of whom, but, upon examination, was, either for want of will or for want of abilities, found unequal to this formidable antagoniſt. What was to be done? After many propoſals, and much altercation, the reſult

was, to procure and diſtribute into all quarters, a new and ſuperb edition of the *Inſtallation Ode*, both as a complete defenſative againſt the ſlaſhes of this ſtate anatomiſt, and a proof of what Cambridge could do if ſhe would. A ſuccedaneum which had certainly been adminiſtred, if a Member of the Council, who, along with ſanguine expectations of a preſiding ſtall, is likewiſe ſubject to certain irreſiſtable ticklings of humour, had not *burſt out* into a loud laugh.

Eclauſtris, Oct. 4. CANTABRIGIENSIS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Nov.* 6, 1770.

CANTABRIGIENSIS, in your Chronicle of the 11th ult. ſeems ſurprized, and ſomewhat offended, at my ſaying, that *better things might have been expected* from the oppoſers of a Lecturer there alluded to. By *better things* I certainly meant what he ſuppoſed me to mean; that is, *better things* than "repreſenting the worthy and "ingenious Lecturer to the higher powers as a "promoter of *heretical* doctrines, and uſing en-"deavours to ſilence, and even to bring him to "puniſhment." Such a treatment, however, for which *perſecution* is a name ſoft enough, appears to my keen, but intelligent remarker, to be no worſe than what *might have been expected* from the *characters* of the men engaged in the oppoſition.

The

" The oppoſers," he ſays, " have ſignalized them-
" ſelves, ſo far as I know, by nothing *better* than
" ſophiſtical defences of eſtabliſhed impoſitions,
" and abject endeavours to ſtifle every thing which
" tends to encourage free enquiry, and to deliver
" the human mind from the bondage of blind
" ſyſtem, and ſcholaſtic determination."

But *Cantabrigienſis* will perhaps agree with me, that learned men have ſometimes *ſignalized* themſelves by *writing* in defence of a cauſe which they would be aſhamed, and even abhor, to ſupport in a *worſe* way. Sherlock *wrote* in defence of church-authority againſt Hoadley. But would he have *perſecuted* the man? None have *ſignalized themſelves by ſophiſtical defences of eſtabliſhed impoſitions* more than Warburton. But would Warburton wiſh the civil power to be really *allied* with an intolerant hierarchy? or would he perſecute his inferiors otherwiſe than with his pen? A learned man wrote againſt Phillips, a papiſt. The ſame learned man, as it is ſaid, has employed his pen againſt the author of the Confeſſional, a proteſtant. Yet, though he has expended even more gall of temper, as well as in ink, upon the latter than the former, can we think that he would *act* ſo unlike a proteſtant as he *writes?* Once more; and, it may be thought, more *ad rem;* Let Cantabrigienſis view his own Profeſſor and his ſophiſtical *Vindication* of ſubſcription to human ſyſtems of faith, through the ſame medium that his candid *Examiner* has done, and he will not judge of the *man* altogether from the *cauſe* in which he employs his *literary* talents, but *expect better things* from him, than thoſe which have happened to the Lecturer.

—" After all," ſays the Examiner, " I would not " have the learned man, whoſe argument I have " freely examined, think that he is repreſented as " being of an intolerant and *perſecuting ſpirit*. I " mean not to do it.—I have not done it.—I think " him not ſuch.—The principles on which he hath " *reaſoned*, are very different from thoſe on which, " I believe, he would *act* in a higher, and on " which he *appears to act* in his preſent ſphere of " eccleſiaſtical authority. *Theſe* are every day " bringing honour to the *Man*, in their apparent " influence on his conduct, while *thoſe*, miſtaken " for principles of a better kind than they really " are, appear to the diſcredit of the *Writer*."*—— This Author then ſhall be my apologiſt for *paſt expectations*. As to any future expectations of *better things*, from men of the Profeſſor's caſt, I am ſorry in believing, that Cantabrigienſis, being no ſtranger to the " dirty intrigues of the jeſuitical " clan," has it in his power effectually to convince me how groundleſs they would be.

In the mean time it muſt be ſome comfort to the worthy Lecturer, under all his diſcouragements, that he muſt have every *ſincere* friend to religious liberty on his ſide: And I particularly congratulate him on being abetted in his uſeful and laudable undertaking by one of my Remarker's complexion and ſpirit, from which *expectations of the beſt things* are formed and indulged by

HOADLEIANUS.

Wincheſter, Oct. 23.

For

* Examination of Dr. Rutherford's Argument againſt the Confeſſional.

For the LONDON CHRONICLE.

Nov. 13, 1770.

Notes upon a Paſſage in Signor BARETTI's *Journey from* London *to* Genoa, VOL. I. p. 170.

" ONE GAGES an Engliſhman (who ſuggeſted " to Cromwell the ſcheme of taking Jamaica " from the Spaniards) in a printed account of " America, has given us an old Mexican ſong " (words and muſic) which is in rhyme, and com- " poſed long before Columbus was born." *Baretti.*

One GAGES *an Engliſhman*] There never was any ſuch Engliſhman. The perſon here meant was Thomas Gage, the ſon of a Roman Catholic Gentleman of an ancient and honourable family, ſettled at Hailing-Houſe near Croydon in Surry, and nearly allied to Sir John Gage of Fyrle in Suſſex. Thomas Gage was educated in Spain, with a view to his becoming a Jeſuit, to which order his father was extremely attached, and the ſon extremely averſe. He became a Dominican, and was prevailed with to join the miſſion from Spain to Mexico, in the year 1625, where he reſided about twelve years, and returned to England in the year 1637, or 1638. His eldeſt brother was Sir Henry Gage, a Colonel in King Charles the Firſt's army, and Governor of Oxford, who was ſlain in an attempt to ſurprize Abingdon, with a

party commanded by Prince Rupert, in 1644. Another of his brothers was a Prieſt, and in high confidence with K. Charles's Queen. And ſo much for *One* Gages *an Engliſhman*.

Who ſuggeſted to Cromwell the ſcheme of taking Jamaica from the Spaniards] The firſt attempt of the armament ſet out by Cromwell in 1655 was upon Hiſpaniola, which having miſcarried, the Commanders attacked Jamaica (a much inferior object) the conqueſt of which was of ſo little conſideration with Cromwell, that Venables who commanded the land forces, was, upon his return to England, committed to the Tower, the failure of the *firſt* enterprize being imputed to his miſconduct. Whitelock ſays, that the Protector ſet forth this fleet, " by the advice of one Gage, a Miniſter, " who had been long in the Weſt Indies," and Biſhop Burnet makes a much longer ſtory of it, but is groſsly miſtaken in ſaying, that Gage came over from the Weſt Indies, " while Cromwell was " balancing whether he ſhould make peace with " the French or the Spaniards." This *balancing* refers to the year 1654, and Gage had then been returned from the Weſt Indies ſixteen years, viz. ever ſince the year 1638 at the lateſt. That Cromwell might have ſome conference with Gage on that occaſion, is not improbable. But Biſhop Burnet's ſtory of the *Map*, is utterly incredible. Mr. Gage's Hiſtory was republiſhed in the year 1655, with Maps of America, the Iſlands of the Weſt Indies, the Terra Firma of New Spain, &c. engraven at the expence of Michael Sparke, and was in every body's hands. It is moſt probable, Cromwell might take the firſt hint of his project from

from this Hiſtory, and afterwards talk with the Author on the feaſibility of it.

In a printed account of America] Namely, *A Survey of the Weſt Indies*, a book which hath gone through five or ſix editions, and has not yet loſt its eſtimation among Mr. Gage's countrymen. This *printed account* was thought to be ſo valuable and important in France as well as in England, that by order of the great Colbert, it was tranſlated into French, by *Hugh O Neal*, Sieur de *Beaulieu*. An honour which will hardly be done to *one Baretti's printed account of Portugal, Spain, &c.*

Hath given us an old Mexican ſong] Rather, two ſongs. Here they are:

" *Salid Mexicanas, bailad Toncontin,*
" *Canſalas galanas, en cuerpo gentil.*
" And again,
" *Salid Mexicanas bailad Toncontin,*
" *Ai Rey de la gloria tenemos acqui.*

Words and muſic] Here are the *words*, but where is the *muſic?*

Which is in rhyme] The *rhyme* is juſt as far to ſeek, as the *muſic*.

And compoſed long before Columbus was born.] If ſo, theſe Mexicans muſt have been Chriſtians before Columbus was born. For thus writeth Mr. Thomas Gage: " Another Mexican dance they " uſe, ſome cloathed like men, others like women, " which in heatheniſh times they did uſe with " ſinging praiſes unto their King and Emperor. " But *now* they apply their *ſongs* unto the King " of Glory, or unto the ſacrament, uſing theſe, " or commonly the like words, with very little

" difference, and ſome variety of praiſe." [*Read*, phraſe] *Salid*, &c. as above.

This compound of ignorance and impertinence in a caſe where this prating Scioliſt might have known better, and where he ought to have ſpoken of his reſpectable Author with more decency, teaches us what to think of the *Signor*'s candor and veracity, in other inſtances where he cannot ſo eaſily be traced. Some part of his petulance may poſſibly be accounted for by the following additional account of Mr. Thomas Gage.

When he came from the Weſt Indies, he had a deſign to turn Proteſtant, induced thereto by having been a witneſs of the rogueries and enormities of the Romiſh Prieſts both in Old and New Spain, which he relates in his *Survey* with all freedom, contrary to the practice of Signor Baretti, who covers the failings of his ghoſtly fathers with his ſilken mantle, or touches on them with the greateſt tenderneſs. Mr. Gage, in the year 1640, and while he was endeavouring to inform himſelf of the grounds of the religion he thought to embrace, undertook a journey to Rome, where he learned a number of circumſtances tending to prove Archbiſhop Laud's connexions with the Papiſts, which he had in part diſcovered during his ſtay in England. His account of theſe diſcoveries made a great part of the 22d chapter of his *Survey*, in the folio edition of 1655, and that before it. But after the Reſtoration, when the book was republiſhed in octavo, that chapter was dropped, to prevent the ſcandal which might have been derived upon the memory of the deceaſed Prelate, and the reputation of his high-church diſciples by the publi-

cation

cation of thoſe anecdotes. This was not all. The folio edition of 1655 was dedicated to Thomas Lord Fairfax, with a warm acknowledgment of the public virtue of that great and good man. This dedication, after expunging the paſſages relating immediately to the Patron, the Curators of the Expurgatory Index, formed into a *Preface*, the ſame which is now prefixed to the octavo editions of the *Survey*. Upon his return from Rome to England in 1641, Mr. Gage made open profeſſion of the Proteſtant religion, and was preferred by the parliament to the living of Deal in Kent. The laſt we hear of him in our general hiſtories, is of his giving his advice to Cromwell to attack the Spaniſh Weſt Indies. How long he lived after that advice, or where he died, I cannot learn. It is preſumed that he died before the ſhocking execution of the *Bartholomew-act* in 1662, as another perſon is named in Dr. Calamy's account to have been ejected from Deal. Here is ſufficient provocation to ſuch a bigot as Baretti (not to mention ſome of his nominally proteſtant friends) to treat Mr. Gage with contempt. It was not however kindly done of his friends of the New Academy, to ſuffer him to blunder ſo egregiouſly in a matter where neither Mr. Gage's extraction, nor the reputation of his valuable hiſtory were at all concerned. I am, &c.

A Deſcendant from ONE GAGE.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Leiceſter, Nov.* 20.

YOU are deſired to inform the Gentleman who publiſhed the valuable and entertaining account of Mr. THOMAS GAGE, in the Chronicle of Nov. 13, but ſeemed not to know where that extraordinary perſon died, that *Ludlow*, ſpeaking of the expedition to the Weſt Indies, in 1655, and of the numbers that died through the heat of the climate, ſays, "In this expedition one Mr. GAGE, "a Prieſt, died alſo, who was reported to have "been a principal adviſer of this undertaking."— Ludlow's Memoirs, Vol. II. page 533, of the edition ſaid to be printed at Vevay, 1698.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Dec.* 15, 1770.

IT cannot but give pleaſure to a liberal mind to obſerve, that, in the preſent patriotic ſtruggle for our *civil* liberty, the importance of *religious* freedom is not overlooked. A love of ſacred truth

is

is hardly conſiſtent with an abſolute indifference about its reception in the world. And its ſucceſs, in this reſpect, evidently depends in a great degree upon the courſe it is allowed to take, under the laws and inſtitutions which obtain in any country.

In *this* country the reſtraints upon it from legal authority, or the influence of adminiſtration, are gratefully owned to be fewer and lighter than in any other. At the ſame time, it muſt be owned, that even *here* it lies under *too* many reſtraints; ſome of which are both too obvious to eſcape notice, and too important not to merit the wiſh and endeavour of every wiſe and good man to have them removed. Thanks be to that ſtrenuous champion of proteſtantiſm, who has ſo boldly led the way to reformation, by developing our (long obſcured) claims, as *Chriſtians*; not afraid, in ſo good a cauſe, to commit himſelf with men, whom intereſt, envy, or ambition, muſt be ſuppoſed to ſtimulate to an opponency.

The writer of the *Confeſſional* is generally *reputed* to be a clergyman of the church of England. His celebrated coadjutor Dr. Benjamin Dawſon, is *known* to be one. A ſmart writer on the ſame ſide has *remarked* upon an opponent of the cauſe, under a *ſignature* which announces him to be alſo of the eſtabliſhment. I have often thought, that if a farther reformation, by the inſtrumentality of the pen, could be hoped for, it was moſt likely to come from *that* quarter. And indeed, ſo far as the bond of ſubſcription comes in queſtion, I can ſee no great propriety in non-conforming miniſters concerning themſelves with it. It is not ſo immediately *their* cauſe. Accordingly they generally

plead

plead it unſkilfully, and give manifeſt ſymptoms of their incompetency of judgment.

This obſervation, however, I would reſtrict to the queſtion concerning the *obligation* which ſubſcription to the thirty-nine articles brings a clergyman under. For, as to theſe *general* rights, reſpecting religion, which as *men*, *chriſtians*, and *proteſtants*, we of theſe kingdoms may claim, let *all* be invited to unite their beſt endeavours to unfold and vindicate them. And, as a farther reformation in the church of England, on the footing propoſed in the *Confeſſional*, could not fail of being favourable to thoſe rights, it is the *intereſt* of diſſenters to help forward ſo good a cauſe, as well as their *duty* to wiſh it ſucceſs for the ſake of ſome worthy clergymen, who are more particularly concerned in its fate. But let them be cautious of engaging, though in the beſt of cauſes, with ſuch zeal, as hath already manifeſted itſelf to be not altogether *according to knowledge*.

A WORD *to the wiſe*, Mr. Printer, is enough. But if I ſhould ſeem to your readers to ſend forth my caution in too ænigmatical a way to be underſtood by thoſe, who might be *wiſe* enough to profit by it, I may, with your leave, take an opportunity to explain it, if deſired.

DISCRETION.

Liverpoale.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Jan.* 5, 1770.

AN unexpected call from my dormitory in the upper regions of *Drone-hall* into a field of active diſſipation, for a few weeks paſt, hath prevented my expreſſing the reſpectful thanks I acknowledge to be due to *Hoadleianus* for his genteel rebuke of my peeviſh ſtrictures on his *firſt* letter. And now that I am returned to my academical cell, I have nothing to anſwer to his *ſecond*, but that, while his expectation of *better things* is built upon a diſtant contemplation of placid countenances, and equivocal profeſſions, we in this place have opportunities of ſeeing the maſk ſtripped off, and of perceiving that it is really no better than a covering for the inſide of an inquiſition.

Hoadleianus, however, miſtakes me, if he imagines I meant to diſſect the individuals of the Junto combined againſt the ingenious lecturer. That would be a work of years, and would likewiſe be much the ſame thing as diſſecting the heart of every honeſt proteſtant, which muſt be pierced to the quick, to ſee his religion quite ſuffocated by jeſuitical defences of certain cumberſome ſyſtems, which are enough to ſtifle it by their own weight, without the additional preſſure of theſe officious aſſaſſins.

He

He mentions a certain character, to which a teſtimony is given by a worthy writer, to whom I am inclined to pay as much regard as the nature of the caſe will admit of. But the criterion of judging of a tree by its *fruits* would, I am afraid, be too hard in the preſent caſe for the deference due to ſo very reſpectable an apologiſt. Poſterity, who reads the hiſtory of this ancient ſeminary (once the nurſe of liberal ſcience and generous principles) will be aſtoniſhed that at this period, and within ſo few years of a better ſpirit, he ſhould deny a public audience to a ſcholaſtic exerciſe, merely becauſe the ſubject of it was, that *a man who makes the commands of Chriſt the rule of his moral conduct, and believes all that Chriſt taught, ought not to be excluded from chriſtian communion.* Will not the apologiſt allow, that the man, who was averſe to the diſcuſſion of this great proteſtant truth, muſt have raiſed *expectations of better things*, only by putting on a vizard which did not belong to him? But the hiſtory will ſhortly be given at length, and to that I beg leave to refer your candid correſpondent *Hoadleianus*.

In the mean time the worthy Lecturer hath ſubmitted his plan to public judgment, to the no ſmall mortification of his adverſaries, ſome of whom, notwithſtanding all their grimace, are almoſt as much averſe to the *heterodoxy* of one another, as the bulk of them are to *his*; as plainly appeared upon the death of a late prelate, when the trumpet of fame announced a ſucceſſor who had formerly drolled away, with much pleaſantry, but more acrimony, on the furniture of our profeſſorial chair. The conſternation indeed was general, but more par-

particularly remarkable in the faces of ſome of the Junto, to whom the idea of a *viſitor* is by no means pleaſing, even when attended with every emblem of lenity.

Was not this to confeſs, that they themſelves dreaded to be under a government, to the diſcipline of which they would willingly have conſigned a man, to whom much of the little credit we have left, as a body, is owing. Was not this to betray a painful conſciouſneſs of having *once* known better principles? There may be dunces among us who are in earneſt, and who know no more than what they have learnt from other dunces; but ſhame, and double ſhame to thoſe who are become callous to the generous documents of their earlier years, by a conſtant courſe of political gambling for ſtalls and mitres.

Ye virtuous patriots, who have been ſo ſucceſsful in laying open to your injured countrymen the iniquities of their *civil* oppreſſors (the principal foſterers of theſe men's ambition) have ye no drenches for theſe eccleſiaſtical cormorants?

I am, &c.

CANTABRIGIENSIS.

E Clauſtris,
Dec. 1770.

For the ST. JAMES'S CHRONICLE.

Feb. 23, 1771.

An APOLOGY.

"WHAT may be the reaſon," ſaid a Gentleman the other day, "that the demiſe of "Dr. Jortin, the firſt ſcholar of his country, and "perhaps of his age, has been ſo little noticed? "Why are we ſtunned with the eulogies of a "Secker, and a Whitefield? and why is even a "Sterne buſted and bronzed, while the remains of "a man, to whom Dr. Browne's coloſſus was leſs "than a pigmy, are conſigned to the duſt with as "little noiſe and ceremony, as if the crowner's "queſt-law had found him *felo de ſe?* How comes "it that ———

"How comes it, Sir? Have you never heard of "Jorton's preface; of that incomparable preface "which introduces his remarks on eccleſiaſtical "hiſtory? Why, dear Sir, Luther himſelf was not "more obnoxious in his day, for touching the pon-"tifical crown, and the bellies of the monks, than "Jortin is to the modern hierarchiſts, for ſome "ſtrokes in that preface. In vain had he ſet "chriſtianity upon its proper baſis, firm and im-"pregnable againſt the efforts of little, quibbling,

"de-

" declaiming infidels; he inſinuated blemiſhes and " defects in our eccleſiaſtical conſtitution, and the " neglect of things commendable; he rallied the " abſurdity of compelling a man to ſwear, that he " will never alter his opinions about controverſial " divinity; which being explained by the preſent " practice, means the ſame thing as giving it un- " der his hand, that he is as great a novice at his " inſtallation into a deanery, as he was at his ma- " triculation, and is juſt as wiſe in his grand cli- " macteric, as he was in his ſeventeenth year. " ' Men,' ſays Jortin, ' will compel others, not " ' to think with them, for that is impoſſible, but " ' to *ſay* they do, upon which they obtain full " ' leave not to think or reaſon at all, and this they " ' call *Unity*.' This was wormwood to the hiera- " gogues, and fixed upon the author the indelible " ſin of aiming at reformation; and can you after " this be ſurprized, that in this ſtifling, blinking " age, every mean, dirty effort ſhould be uſed to " conſign his merit (if poſſible) to utter oblivion?"

His preface, indeed, was not his only crime. When about ſeven years after he publiſhed The Life of Eraſmus, many were the bitter pills he adminiſtered to the great churchmen, which however handſomely gilded, ſtuck in their throats, and raiſed their ſtomachs, and had their hands been at liberty, *facti eſſent pugiles, et medicum urſiſſent*. A number of boobies and bigots are there whipped upon the backs of the oppoſers of Eraſmus and Luther; and there were not wanting men of more aſſurance and leſs ſcrupuloſity to make the application. Theſe adventurers readily diſcerned the foxes that lodged at the root, and

and the birds of ill omen that ſcreamed in the branches of the poiſonous theological tree, and they made no ſecret of it to the world.

"You forget, Sir," ſaid a byſtander, "that "this very obnoxious writer had for his patrons "two of the firſt prelates in the kingdom, by "whoſe bounty and benevolence he was remarka-"bly and laudably diſtinguiſhed."

No, Sir, I do not forget it. Theſe Prelates were—what they were. They wanted what Jortin had, a reputation for letters; and it was worth venturing ſomething to have their feeble fame pinned to the ſkirts of a man whoſe writings, as they were informed, would be read and admired as long as any pittances of good ſenſe, ſolid erudition, and exalted liberality of mind ſhould remain upon Engliſh ground. The oſtenſible motive to one of theſe patrons, when the preferment was given, was Jortin's Diſcourſes on the Chriſtian Religion. The dangerous Preface was then in its infancy, and the outcry againſt it had not reached the ulterior bank of the Thames. It has been ſaid, the Patron never heard the laſt of his injudicious munificence to a man, who had affronted the eſtabliſhment that maintained him. On the other hand, the preferment was paid for in two Dedications, and *a ſacrifice after ſunſet*, which coſt Jortin more in ſubſtantial eſtimation than the profits of the donation made amends for.

The other connection had not a different original, but a different pretence. The Patron, any more than Jortin, was not a man of compliment. It was ſuppoſed he might dragoon Jortin into practicability; and the acceſſion of ſo reſpectable

an

an ally to the ſide of eccleſiaſtical policy, would have been a moſt valuable acquiſition. Jortin had the luck to profit by the manœuvre, but the reſt of the project failed, partly by the want of humanizing talents in the undertaker, and partly by the want of ductility in the materials he had to work upon.

Our hero had an eſcape from a third connection with a dignified brother. A man who looks upon himſelf to be a ſort of univerſal Piece-broker to men and women of letters, down from Pope as low as the Author of Clariſſa, and a Female Philoſoper of the North, who dealt in that kind of ſmall wares, intituled, Miſcellanies in Proſe and Verſe.

Jortin wanted neither his prefaces nor his notes, and civilly declined that ſort of aſſiſtance; but by ſome fatality was duped, not only to accept of a poſtſcript to the firſt volume of his Eccleſiaſtical Remarks, exhibiting the viſions of a Welch prophet, with the wiſe commentaries of the broker upon them, but to celebrate the new alliance with an *ibit et hoc noſtri per ſæcula fœdus amoris.*

Upon this occaſion, Jortin's ſimplicity was rallied even to the very edge of his patience. His humiliation was more than he could bear. However he ſuppreſſed his bluſhes till he had a proper opportunity of rectifying his miſtake, by ſhewing, that the critical abilities of his new friend were more properly exerciſed on Rice Evans's terreſtrial viſion, than on the ſubterraneous ſcenery of Virgil.

A controverſy was the unſhunned conſequence; the pleaſantry, as well as the ſting of which was, that the broker's foreman objected to Jortin a want

want of delicacy. All the world laughed at the conceit, and Jortin himſelf was ſurprized into a grin. "How comes it, John," ſaid a friend of his, "that you ſhould have the reputation of leſs "delicacy than the broker?" "I'll tell you," ſays the Doctor, "Rambling one day into the "environs of the Zodiac, inſtead of making my "bow and my ſpeech, I happened to turn my "poſteriors upon *Urſa Major*."

Be then no longer ſurprized, Sir; exclaim no more againſt the ingratitude or the ſtupidity of the age. Be aſſured the church will canonize no ſuch ſpirits as Dr. Jortin. And that being well underſtood among the authoriſed panegyriſts, it would not, they know, be adviſeable for them to do ſuch a man even common juſtice.

ÆACUS.

FINIS.